R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 879 AC 001 399

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (52D, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, APRIL 22-25, 1967).

BY- SENECAL, ROBERT SMITH, HARRY
IOWA UNIV., IOWA CITY, INST. OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

PUB DATE AUG 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.32 58P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, *LEADERSHIP, *CHANGE AGENTS, *SOCIAL CHANGE, *UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, URBAN AREAS, EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, CONFLICT, COMMUNITY SERVICES, COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, COLLEGE STUDENTS, LEADERSHIP TRAINING, AREA STUDIES, BEHAVIOR CHANGE, SOCIAL STRUCTURE, POPULATION DISTRIBUTION, COMMUNITY LEADERS, WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS, TITLE I HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

IN PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE 1967 MEETING OF THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION, A UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIRECTOR, ACADEMIC EXPERTS ON COMMUNITY THEORY, REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, AND AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, AND FEDERAL ADMINISTRATORS DISCUSS ISSUES AND IDEAS AFFECTING THE ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN HELPING TO IMPROVE COMMUNITIES. THE REQUISITES FOR PURPOSIVE SOCIAL CHANGE ARE EXAMINED AGAINST THE BACKDROP OF COMPLEX SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND RAPIDLY CHANGING SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AND VALUES. A HIERARCHICAL GEOGRAPHIC MODEL IS SET FORTH TO ILLUSTRATE A CONCEPTION OF URBAN GROWTH AND FUNCTIONS. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IS VIEWED IN TERMS OF THE KINDS OF LEADERSHIP NEEDED TO HELP CITIZENS MEET ECONOMIC AND OTHER PROBLEMS THAT REQUIRE GROUP DECISION AND GROUP ACTION. A PROPOSED COLLEGE-PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM WOULD ENGAGE STUDENTS (MAINLY UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATES) IN SEMINARS, WORKSHOPS, AND PRACTICAL SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY, EITHER DURING THE SCHOOL TERM OR IN VACATION PERIODS. FINALLY, TWO ASSESSMENTS OF THE OUTLOOK FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE AND PLANNING POLICY UNDER TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 GIVE EVIDENCE OF BOTH SUCCESS AND FAILURE IN DEVELOPING COMPREHENSIVE, INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS FOUNDED ON THE BASIC PROCESSES OF SOCIAL CHANGE. (LY)

ED012879

L.C.Educ

Community Development in Transition

Institute of Public Affairs
The University of Iowa
Iowa City

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN TRANSITION

Proceedings of the Division of Community Development,
Fifty-second Annual Meeting
National University Extension Association

April 22-25, 1967

Institute of Public Affairs
The University of Iowa - Iowa City
August 1967

FOREWORD

Community Development represents a body of experience and thought through which communities can analyze and interpret change. This material is frequently subjected to interdisciplinary scrutiny at meetings of the National University Extension Association.

These Proceedings reflect the results of this scrutiny in seeking imaginative solutions to community problems. The papers were presented at the 1967 NUEA Conference held at The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 22-25, 1967.

Robert Senecal and Harry Smith of the Institute staff prepared these papers for publication.

Dean Zenor, Director
Institute of Public Affairs

August 1967

CONTENTS

Community Theory and Community Development
by Rolland L. Warren 1

The Missouri Growth Center Concept for Community Development
Hugh Denney 18

Making Community Development Operational
J. Carroll Bottum 24

Students, Schools, Service, and Society--A New Mix
Joseph G. Colmen 30

Community Service and Continuing Education Programs under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965
Paul V. Delker 37

The Situation Around Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965
D. Mack Easton 43

Community Theory and Community Development

Roland L. Warren*

Let me explain the somewhat cryptic title for my paper today--"Community Theory and Community Development." As we all know, there is a great change taking place in the institutional life of Western society, indeed, of virtually the whole world. In recent decades, as a part of this change, a comparatively new component has been added to the process of social change: a developing body of experience and knowledge regarding the channeling or bringing about of change as a matter of rational intent. I should like today to explore the implications of these two developments, to relate them to each other, and to draw some implications for efforts at purposive change at the community level. For purposes of clarity, I have grouped my thoughts under the heading of twelve assertions, or propositions.

1. <u>There is a widely prevalent pattern of interrelated developments which can be designated as the "great change."</u> Many observers have noted an interrelated cluster of changes which have been associated largely with Western society but which are coming to be recognized as characterizing other societies as well. On the practical level, these changes have been grouped together in such concepts as modernization, or urbanization, or industrialization, or development. Some of these designations suggest what appears to be a natural process in the sense that it occurs without overall conscious, deliberate intervention, while others, like modernization and development, especially, seem to connote more of the idea of conscious social intent.

This great transition in modes of social living has likewise been the subject for scholarly analysis, and a number of theoretical concepts have been utilized to refer to it. Examples are Maine's distinction between status and contract, Durkheim's development of the concepts of mechanical and organic solidarity, Toennies' contrasting of <u>Gemeinschaft</u> and <u>Gesellschaft</u>. A number of other theoretical characterizations come readily to mind. Each of them purports to describe a unidirectional development from one kind of configuration of society to another.

It is this overriding transition which I mean to designate through the term "the great change." To be more specific, I should like to enumerate, briefly, a number of salient dimensions of this great change.

---

*Professor of Community Theory, The Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University

First, as Durkheim noted, there occurs a progressive division of labor. Occupational tasks formerly performed by a single individual become divided in such a manner that various collectivities share in the performance of one or another part of the task, and individuals within these collectivities perform an even more specialized role. I need only remind you of the obvious historical concomitants of this process: the tendency away from self-sufficiency, the intricate network of delicately interrelated parts of the productive system, the dependence on a money economy, the psychological difference between working on aggregate tasks or working on fragments of tasks.

Closely associated with the growing division of labor is another important development, a differentiation of interests and association. As productive tasks become more complex and individuals and organizations accommodate themselves to the various fragmented parts of these tasks, they find themselves allying themselves with others of similar occupation to further their own economic interests, and they find themselves associating with each other socially as well. Such social selection takes place not only on the basis of the division of labor, but also on that of a new possibility which the changed situation generates: the possibility of associating with other people on the basis of congeniality of personalities or mutuality of interests, rather than merely on the basis of geographic proximity.

At the same time, division of labor and differentiation of interests and association have resulted in the development of strong relations of people to systems which extend beyond their community borders. Thus, as communities have undergone a process of internal economic and social differentiation, their differentiated parts have developed strong links to their respective extra-community occupational and interest groups. The same is true of the various types of organizations which are found in communities, whether governmental or nongovernmental, profit or nonprofit.

A related development, as intricate national systems and organizations arise around differentiated functions and interests, is the development of bureaucratization and impersonalization. The extremely complex network of organizations and systemic interconnections is literally impossible to maintain without systematizing those interrelationships, clearly defining procedures, developing specific norms of obligation and performance, and in the process providing for a regularity and dependability of behavior and relationships which implies a set of circumstances which are experienced as depersonalization. We have the widely-heralded situation of the individual presumably "lost" in the web of impersonal relationships of bureaucratized organizations in the "mass society." At the same time, changes operate to weaken many of the older ties based on kinship, custom, and common residence.

Closely related to these processes is a transfer of functions which were formerly performed by family, neighborhood, and local community, to voluntary organizations, profit enterprise, and governmental offices. The result is that increasingly, organized efforts to achieve social objectives occur within the rubric of one of these three types of formal organizations.

A concomitant of the economic and social developments already

enumerated is the growth of cities and suburbs. Actually, as we all are aware, some of the largest cities are declining in population. But this is only an artifact of the arbitrary political divisions within our metropolitan aggregates. Indeed, the decline in size of the largest cities is functionally related to the increase in size of the metropolitan areas of which they are the core. In addition, there is a growth of smaller cities and a growth in the nonfarming components of the rural populations.

I shall add only one other major characteristic of the great change: it seems to me that a noticeable change in values is discernable. One is the gradual acceptance of governmental activity as a positive value in an increasing number of fields. Another is the gradual change from a moral interpretation of human behavior to a causal one. That is, increasingly we find our selves placing more stress on the causes of behavior than on moral admonitions to the "sinner" to improve his ways. Associated with this is a changing approach to social problems, from one of sporadic moral reform to one of gradual rational planning. Not so closely related, perhaps, but nevertheless highly relevant, is what seems to be an increasing change of emphasis from work and production to enjoyment and consumption. The much discussed Protestant ethic has tended to become by an ethic perhaps most dynamically captured in the title of a recent book: Enjoy, Enjoy.

These are the kinds of development which I wish to designate by means of the term "the great change." Nothing mystical is implied in the use of that term, nor are the aspects I have mentioned the only possible way of breaking it up into constituent analytical components. But they will do, for our purposes. Let us go on, then, to my second principal assertion.

2. Community development efforts are related to the "great change" both as cause and effect. I am using these terms loosely, of course. What is implied is that a good part of our efforts to bring about change with conscious intent on the community level is directed at engendering or hastening the great change. This is especially the case in so-called community development efforts in the less-developed countries. Almost by definition, these are countries which are only beginning the great change, and the efforts are designed to stimulate it. Now of course, what is usually consciously intended in community development efforts is to stimulate only certain aspects of the great change, for example those of achieving a more viable economic interrelation of the community and the larger society, bringing the community into the national political picture, developing an industrial base, and so on. But of course my whole point is that these various aspects of the great change are interconnected. It is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve some of them without finding the others tagging along, as more or less unwelcome guests. Many of us are familiar with the dramatization of this fact in the struggle of the Ghandians to protect Indian village ways, even at the sacrifice of the extensive division of labor which others were calling for in India. And right here in the United States, there is intense awareness of the problem of preserving and enhancing community at the same time that industrial development is encouraged. But let me repeat that much of our effort at community change is

in the direction of hastening or encouraging the great change--although we may not be aware of all the implications of this objective.

On the other hand, though, much of our effort at community change is directed at coping with aspects of the great change which have already become apparent and which are perceived as social problems. We seek to cope with family breakdown, which we attribute to certain aspects of the great change, to restore a sense of community which many aspects of the great change have destroyed or jeopardized, or to coordinate the numerous social service activities which have grown up, as a by-product of the division of labor, to cope with the very problems which the division of labor, itself, has helped to generate. Or we seek to rebuild parts of our cities to correct some of the more undesirable concomitants of the great change and to create through social intent an artificial set of community relationships to replace whatever community solidarity had preceded the onset of the great change.

In community change efforts, however, the relationship of social intent to the great change is not the simple "either-or" that I have delineated above. It is not a case of either attempting to induce or attempting to cope with the great change. It is usually a mixture of both. For though the great change is widely prevalent, different countries are ranged differently as to how far they have incorporated it. Some are only beginning. Others are in relatively advanced stages. But there are very few that it has not yet affected; and at the other extreme, there are none where it has fully run its course. Further, within various countries, including the United States, different regions are differently ranged according to how far the great change has progressed. Even within a single state, efforts at industrial and educational and social development take place at the same time as efforts to cope with the problems caused by such development.

3. The great change, in strengthening vertical ties, has tended to weaken horizontal ties. A city the size of Detroit, say, is a huge confusion of different organizations, governmental and nongovernmental, of various types in various sectors of activity, in addition to being composed of people with various interests and affiliations and various degrees of racial or ethnic identification, who are associated with each other not only in formal organizations but also through informal networks of kinship, communications links, casual acquaintanceships, intimate friendships, and the like. How does the whole thing hang together at all?

In considering this question, I have found the concepts of horizontal pattern and vertical pattern to be useful. By horizontal pattern I simply mean the relationship of community units to each other, whether these units be churches, schools, businesses, governmental departments, stores, voluntary associations, governmental and nongovernmental social service agencies, labor unions, or whatnot. These relations are called horizontal because they cut across a number of different sectors of interest and activity at about the same level, namely, that level on which these diverse kinds of activity are interested in each other for the primary reason that they are located together in the same, rather confined, city space, and that their respective behavior has an impact on each other.

No city has been able to organize these horizontal relationships in any all-inclusive formal way, and we might not want to do so even if we could. But most cities have organizations which succeed to at least a modest extent in organizing segments of activity into either a tight organizational pattern or a loose federative or coalitional structure. In other words, we do have community-wide organizations which presumably speak for the community in some important sectors of the community's interests. These include the various departments of the city government, the board of education, the council of churches, the urban renewal authority, the health and welfare council, the antipoverty agency, the transportation authority, and so on. It is really surprising that we know so little in a systematic way about the interaction among these large community decision organizations, and exploring this interaction happens to be a high priority interest and activity of mine at the present time.

But let us turn for a moment to another important dimension--one which is becoming increasingly noticeable as time goes on. That is the relation of local units--be they economic, or social service, or governmental, or whatever--to organizations and networks outside of the local community. The local banks, the local industrial companies, the local post office, the local churches, the local health and welfare agencies, the local unions, the local professional organizations--all have varying degrees of direct or indirect relationship to extra-community systems. In many cases, these varied units may have considerable autonomy. In other cases, there is little room for local determination of what form they shall take, each unit being merely a sort of local branch of a national organization, corporation, or of the federal or state government. This bundle of relationships which local units in the community have to extra-community systems is what I have come to describe with the term vertical pattern.

Quite obviously, the behavior of community units can therefore be seen from two standpoints: their locally-oriented behavior toward each other, and their behavior which links them to extra-community systems. These two dimensions are never entirely absent from actions of community or neighborhood significance.

Let us leave this matter for the moment, noting only that few if any actions of the community actually involve a broad activation of all the possible persons and organizations along the horizontal axis or along the vertical axis, either. Most routine community activity, insofar as it involves one or more actors, takes place through exchange relations which have become fairly systematized, whether or not within some such rubric as the welfare council or the chamber of commerce. Nonroutine actions, on the other hand, are usually taken by a number of actors who enter into ad hoc coalitions to accomplish some purpose. As the number of important change programs increases, especially those with financial support from the federal government, the community field becomes so crowded and overlapping that it becomes awkward to carry on anything but routine exchanges between organizations through formal machinery. Rather, ad hoc groupings spring up around specific issues. I would venture that community viability today--what Leonard

Cottrell calls "community competence"--is associated positively with this ability to form nonroutine, functional, ad hoc coalitions of various actors on various levels in various combinations in order to get specific jobs done and then fade out in favor of new combinations called for by new tasks.

I have already noted some of the ways in which local ties to social systems in the larger society have been strengthened by the great change, and how it is part of the effort of much community development and economic development effort to build and strengthen such ties. I have also indicated that various aspects of the great change tend to operate to weaken the importance and the viability of older institutions based on a pre-industrial, agrarian, or "pre-great change" situation. Many functions once vital for family, neighborhood, and community, are now performed by large-scale organizations of various types. The shared fate which formed a social bond between people who lived close to each other is no longer so important in comparison with the many important social bonds which they hold respectively but do not share.

There is, of course, much nostalgia about an overidealized conception of healthy and strong and inherently satisfying values present in family, neighborhood, and community social interrelationships of pre-great change times. But underneath this perhaps superficial and in part specious conception of the nature of earlier horizontal bonds, that is, ties which linked people together in meaningful ways on the basis of their common locality, there is a quite contemporary problem of whether people in a specific locality, say a metropolitan area such as that of Detroit, or a smaller city or village, or a specific neighborhood within the city, are capable of confronting jointly the problems which they actually do share because of their mutual propinquity. Here is an important contemporary function for community change efforts--to help develop, where they do not exist, a social base for an effective confrontation of problems as they are experienced in one's own locality.

In this activity, two observations would seem to be particularly cogent. First, many of the problems which local people confront cannot adequately be coped with on a local basis alone. And second, the development of local viability for confronting those aspects of problems which are appropriate for intervention on the locality level need not imply a vain and Quixotian attempt to reconstruct in the modern metropolis or small city a set of social relationships which may have been suited to the horse and buggy era.

Now let me state two propositions and then consider them together.

4. Most social change is nonpurposive, or without social intent, in any inclusive sense.

5. Purposive change is usually superficial and secondary.

The assertion that most social change is nonpurposive, or without aggregate social intent, requires further brief elaboration, for especially in discussions among practitioners at the community level, it is frequently overlooked. Most purposive change at the community level is a response to problems arising from the unplanned aggregate of individual decisions by persons, families, and organizations of one type or another as they pursue their interests and objectives. Such activity, in aggregate, is perceived as population increase or decrease or redistribution, either geographically or by

age-sex category; or as "suburban growth," or "industrial growth," or "increasing automation," or higher longevity, or increased marriage or divorce rates, smaller average size of family, and so forth. Most of what is called "planned social change" is a relatively modest response to these larger changes which are taken as "given" and are not the result of concerted, deliberate, centralized decision-making. Unemployment insurance is instigated to meet the contingency of unemployment, rather than prevent it; city planning commissions take adaptive measures in view of such changes as population decline in the central city, suburban growth, new industrial location patterns, and the commuting phenomenon; social services are developed to help families whose individual lives dramatize the results of some of the larger changes.

As organizations and activities are thus set up to adapt in part to the largely uncontrolled changes which take place, these organizations themselves become part of the changing scene. In their activities, they may compete with each other in undesirable or wasteful ways, or they may leave gaps in available service, or their aggregate endeavors may not be adequate to accomplish their adaptive objectives. Thus, one particular field of planning has to do with establishing some minimum of purposive order among such adaptive organizations. Much of what is called planned change at the community level is of this adaptive type, rather than of any fundamental type which would change or redirect the major flow of events.

Likewise, of course, most of the basic, uncontrolled changes which take place at the community level do so in relation to forces outside of the local community and not subject to its deliberate control, as in the case of the general price level, or changing industrial production techniques, such as automation.

Similarly, much planned activity on the national level is not subject to conscious control by any single local community, although a single community may affect what goes on there. In other cases, an individual community may have the choice of opting not to collaborate on some national program, but the pressures to collaborate, both from within and from without, are great.

Thus, most purposive social change at the community level is of a secondary, rather than a basic nature, being a response to the uncontrolled aggregate of decisions to do one thing or another by individual actors in the community, or a response to the behavior of various adaptive organizations which have been set up to cope with these basic changes, or a response to changes occurring in the community as part of a national trend and not separable from it.

Having noted this, we are in a position to examine, in perspective, purposive change efforts at the community level. For any attempt to do so must take cognizance of their limited context and relatively superficial level. [1]

---

1. The preceding six paragraphs are taken from the author's "Types of Purposive Social Change at the Community Level," Brandeis University Papers in Social Welfare, No. 11, 1965.

My next assertion is not derived from what has gone before, but in a sense is rather a necessary base, best incorporated at this point, for much of what will follow.

6. What we consider to be community problems are an integral part of the total social system. This is not the place for an extensive depiction of the social system concept as it applies to communities and community change, but since the term will be employed in what follows, let me give a brief indication of what is meant. As two British social scientists have put it:

> In a general way it may be said that to think in terms of systems seems the most appropriate conceptual response so far available when the phenomena under study--at any level and in any domain--display the character of being organized, and when understanding the nature of the interdependencies constitutes the research task.[2]

The social system concept helps us to see that the conditions which we perceive as social problems--whether juvenile delinquency, poverty, lack of adequate housing, unequal opportunities, or various pathologies such as alcoholism and drug addiction--are just as basic to our community system in a country like the United States as are chambers of commerce, welfare councils, or hockey teams. They are all part of the system, having innumerable interconnections with other parts. They cannot be torn out without affecting the whole.

This sounds like a counsel of conservatism and complacency--and I must acknowledge that social system theory is often accused of being conservative, for just this reason. Social system theory directs our attention to the function which a particular phenomenon performs, and for what social system. As a simple example, lack of equal opportunity and impoverished ghettoes serve a number of functions. They keep life simpler and more orderly for those who benefit from the existing inequality; they keep an enormous number of people occupied in various care-giving agencies, including welfare departments, family agencies, neighborhood centers, and in educational institutions, such as schools of social work. They provide a ready source of cheap labor for the kinds of job which hover around the poverty line. I say this only as preface to the simple observation that any condition which is to be changed is likely to have deep functional roots which make it difficult to cut away that particular aspect of the total situation which one dislikes while leaving all the surrounding parts of the system undamaged.

For most changes, someone will have to pay a price of some kind. Perhaps the best example--related to this just-mentioned issue of cheap labor supply in the ghettoes--is the struggle which voluntary agencies, including hospitals, have had in fighting spiraling costs, and the resistance they have often shown against workmen's compensation coverage or minimum wage

---

2. S. E. Emergy and E. L. Trist, "The Causal Texture of Organizational Environments," Human Relations, Vol. 18, No. 1, February, 1965, p. 21.

legislation which would include them. Looked at from the standpoint of their announced objectives, this is difficult to comprehend. Looked at in terms of a social system approach, it becomes easier.

Incidentally, the implication of the above need not be conservatism or do-nothingism. It would be, rather, that if social problems are to be confronted intelligently, one might ask what sort of price is who paying for the existing state of affairs, and how is what party going to be persuaded or forced to pay a part of whatever price is involved in the change?

7. System change is difficult--and ambiguous. These days voices are being raised to assert that the solution to this or that social problem cannot be achieved on a case by case basis, but that rather, the whole configuration of conditions which produce social problems must be changed if substantial improvement is to result. What is needed, these voices assert, is system change. Then they go on to point out that social welfare agencies usually behave in a way so as to maintain the system rather than to change it. So we get this duality between system change and system maintenance. In what sense are social welfare agencies believed to perform an essentially system-maintaining function? I think there are two principal ways.

The first way in which social welfare agencies perform system-maintenance functions is by offering a series of services which presumably ease the burden on those afflicted with one problem or another. By alleviating distress they tend to "keep the lid on," to prevent violent disruptions in the flow of social living. In addition, in the process of alleviating distress, they tend to perform a social control function, that is, to exercise an influence on their clients in the direction of bringing their behavior into closer conformity with that which is usually expected of citizens if the social system is to function as it is.

The second way in which they perform a maintenance function is widely voiced at the present time. Social welfare agencies are controlled very largely by middle or upper class people who have a favored position in the existing order and whose interest would be threatened by drastic changes, particularly changes which would shift the power balance in the direction of the less advantaged.

As a result of these two circumstances, many people allege, most social welfare agencies today are not in a position to initiate the kinds of change in the structure of the social system which generates social problems like inadequate housing, or poverty, or juvenile delinquency, say, which would be necessary if an effective attack were to be launched on these problems. As a consequence, other types of change strategy are called for than can be expected from the community organization activities of the conventional social agencies.

System change is difficult, in any event, for a number of reasons. One is the force of habit. People are accustomed to the status quo, and doing "more of the same" is easier than changing one's ways. Further, change may be actually disruptive. As an example, Sweden is now in the process of changing from driving on the left side of the road to driving on the right. It is encountering innumerable complications in this simple matter-of-fact

change-over. On top of this, as mentioned a moment ago, some people profit more from the present state of affairs than they would if it were changed, and so they oppose it from the standpoint of their own vested interests. In addition, certain ways of doing things take on strong ideological overtones, and so certain changes--as an example, education in the use of contraceptives, or in the United States at present, a negative income tax--meet with strong ideological resistance. Hence, bringing about these system changes, or structural changes, as they are sometimes called, is not easy.

But I should like to observe, also, that the very concepts of system change and system maintenance are concepts which, however useful for purposes of theoretical analysis, are extremely difficult to apply and even to distinguish in the real situation. What from one viewpoint may be considered system change may be looked at from another viewpoint as merely a slight modification in the system to permit it to continue to persist in its present environment. Or, putting this another way, social systems such as organizations or communities are changing all the time, but they are changing only incrementally, for the most part. At the same time, a succession of such incremental changes may aggregate to a situation which is so different that one may feel justified in calling it system change.

Let me give three examples which illustrate changes in configuration which, in my opinion, are large enough to be considered system change. One is the emergence of the poor as a major party in community decisions, where this has been achieved. I need only mention that a new study directed by Professor Kenneth Clark has indicated that many of the efforts at accomplishing this in United States cities have been ineffective. Another would be a substantial change in the configuration of readily accessible opportunities--whether for education, or for employment, or for improved housing or living conditions--surrounding the poor. Another would be a major change in the system of income distribution, such as a sizeable new program of income supplementation.

Needless to say, each such change confronts the types of resistances I mentioned above, and underlying each such change is the question of the extent to which social welfare agencies can or should involve themselves in the heated political controversies within which such public policy matters are fought out. I will return to this question shortly.

8. <u>Purposive social change usually involves setting up an action system</u>. Let me clarify this assertion, for it has important implications. There have been many attempts to set up models of the purposive change process, models which single out important aspects of the process for special attention, so that individual attempts at bringing about change can be compared along the same dimensions. Such models are valuable for research purposes and also constitute an aid to those engaged in attempting to bring about change themselves.

As some of you may know, I too, have attempted to draw up a model within which various change efforts may be analyzed and compared with one another. It is different from most, though not all, other models in that it focuses attention on the combination of individuals or organizations who are

trying to bring about the change, whether this be securing better housing, or providing for a multi-service center, or planning for urban renewal. In most community change episodes, a number of different parties have to be brought together, and their resources and energies have to be organized in ways which are not usually operating. This calls often for a sort of coalition of various parties around the developing objective.

Much of what gets done by way of change, if anything, depends on the behavior of this ad hoc constellation of parties who are working for it. I call this the action system, and have developed a five-stage model which includes the following:

1. initial systemic environment
2. inception of the action system
3. expansion of the action system
4. operation of the expanded action system
5. transformation of the action system[3]

I would like to point out that although we speak of broad community participation, there is virtually no joint activity, except in the most abstract sense, in which an entire community participates. In community change efforts, particularly, it is an exceptional case where as many as 10 per cent of the people participate in any meaningful way. What, then, becomes of the principle of broad community participation? I think that the dictum of broad community participation is extremely vague, so vague as to be misleading as a value and frustrating and often dysfunctional as a strategy. I know that these are not the usual words one hears, but I should like to develop the point further.

Participation can be looked at from two standpoints--its desirability as a democratic value for its own sake, and its necessity as an effective way of achieving change. From the standpoint of its desirability, there are few who would wish to deny all citizens a voice in shaping the institutions among which they live. Yet is is literally impossible for all citizens to keep themselves sufficiently informed about all issues surrounding all the institutions among which they live so that they can even develop a point of view, or indeed, even an interest in the issues involved. Carried to its logical extreme, the principle would call for a community-wide referendum every second of every day. Thus, there must be selectivity of participation in decision-making

Likewise, from the point of view of broad participation as a matter of strategy, the principle itself is little help. One must ask: Participation by whom, or by what groups? For what purpose? As we ask and begin to answer this question, the principle of broad participation is brought down out of the stars and can be dealt with in a rational manner. Let me indicate some of the possible answers to the question of who shall participate, and what for.

I will do so in terms of four functions which are appropriate to most types of community change effort. As the action system which is attempting

---

3. cf. The Community in America (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.), Chapter 10.

to bring about change grows and expands, here are some of the considerations about whom it should expand to include.

9. Purposive change requires legitimation, resources, support from decision-makers, and implementation.

First, there is a function of legitimation. Is our group acknowledged by the relevant community people to have the right to act on behalf of the community in our particular sphere of change efforts? Will people accept us in this action? If not, how can we gain acceptance? What kinds of people and groups can obtain for us this legitimation to act on behalf of the community?

Second, we will need resources to bring about the change. We may need money, we may need expertise, we may need volunteer effort, we may need physical facilities. What kinds of persons or organizations need to be involved in order to secure these things?

Third, whether or not our change is brought about may depend on the deliberate decisions of a relatively limited number of people and organizations. Who are they, and what role do they play in decision-making in the field of our interest, and how can they be reached in such a way that they will identify themselves with our change objectives?

Fourth, whatever the change, it will require implementation. If the change is a new clinical service, will patients avail themselves of this service? Will other agencies refer their patients? What other kinds of action from what kinds of people are necessary if the change is to be a successful one?

From the standpoint of the population of most communities, it would seem that broad participation means the functioning in such matters as the above of the people and organizations whose functioning is appropriate. Let me repeat the four functions: legitimation, resources, decision-making, and implementation.

10. Purposive change may confront apathy or conflict, or both. With respect to this five-stage model of community action, I had one of our Heller School doctoral students helping me during the summer of 1965, by reading thirty-five cases of purposive community change which I had selected from the various published reports which are available. Among other things, I wanted to see if we couldn't improve on this action model, but first I wanted to see whether the model actually "fit" all of these thirty-five cases of change, and if not, why not.

It wasn't long before he came to me and said, "You know, in many of the cases I have no difficulty applying the model, but in others I do have difficulty, for I don't know which action system to apply the model to--the action system which is attempting to bring about the change or the action system which arises to oppose the change."

This was revealing from a number of standpoints. In the first place, here I had quite inadvertently overlooked the whole phenomenon of conflict in developing that action model, basing it rather on the process through which people get together in the community to do something--or, in more precise terms, the ad hoc activation of parts of the horizontal pattern for a particular purpose. But research with these thirty-five cases showed that often there

was a related, but different configuration which became active in opposing the action system. How could I have been so neglectful as to overlook this previously?

The second interesting aspect of this difficulty was that by coincidence I happened to be struggling at the time with a conceptual analysis of consensus and dissensus, and the implications of this for change strategies. I was concerned theoretically with the fit, or lack of fit, between the strategy of intervention by the change agent and the extent to which there was general agreement or disagreement about the desirability of what he was seeking to achieve. I already had the first draft of what later was published as "Types of Purposive Social Change at the Community Level."[4] To put this content quite simply, I analyzed three situations:

1. Where the change agent had consensus on the desirability of what he was trying to bring about.

2. Where the change agent did not have consensus, but thought he could get it, provided he educated people as to the nature of the situation and the desirability of his goal.

3. Where the change agent did not have consensus, and did not think he could obtain consensus, so that he would either have to give up his goal or move ahead without consensus.

The first situation seemed to be appropriate for collaborative, so-called "consensus" strategies; the second seemed appropriate for what I called a "campaign," a definite attempt to persuade; the third seemed to call for various strategies of contest, including conflict.

We decided to operationalize these categories, and apply them to the thirty-five cases. For purposes of simplicity, we sorted the cases into only the first and third--consensus and dissensus.

> In the 35 cases studied, the 21 which took place in a consensus environment differed from those taking place in a dissensus environment. They employed collaborative strategies for change rather than contest strategies. They tended to have task oriented and integration oriented goals about equally; to occur in small communities somewhat more than in large ones; to be almost exclusively nongovernmental in auspices; to involve key leadership in active support, rather than opposition, and to accomplish their goals in most cases.
>
> By contrast, the 14 cases which took place in a dissensus environment tended to employ contest strategies; to have task oriented goals only; to predominate in larger communities; to have a higher proportion of governmental auspices; to involve key leadership actively in both support and

---

4. Roland L. Warren, "Types of Purposive Social Change at the Community Level," Brandeis University Papers in Social Welfare, No. 11, 1965.

opposition, and to fall short of goal accomplishment in most cases.[5]

While the study was not definitive, it nevertheless was surprisingly compatible with the conceptual analysis of consensus and dissensus which had been made independently of it. From it, one can only infer that there are two quite different kinds of community action--with differences in degree becoming so large that they can practically be considered differences in kind. In the one action, you are working in circumstances of general agreement. Your principal obstacle is not opposition, but apathy. Astute judgments as to who should be involved in active participation in the project may help overcome the apathy; further, since there is no basic opposition, it is relatively easy to utilize collaborative techniques, engaging all relevant parties in the various functions listed earlier, and formulating plans fluidly and permissively on the basis of what comes out of the dialogue.

In the other action--the action in dissensus--you cannot do this. Or rather, if you want to utilize this collaborative approach, your goals will be defeated or modified beyond recognition; or, you may bring the opposition into the goal-determining process--what Selznick calls co-optation--and find that you are unable to get agreement to move ahead on any but the most innocuous, inconsequential goals; or, you can exclude important parties from your decision-making, in order to maintain an atmosphere of consensus. Otherwise, if you want to obtain your objective, you can do it only by outmaneuvering or overcoming the opposition. Your obstacle is not apathy--far from it. Your obstacle is active opposition. You are confronted with the choice: Do you want your objective, or do you want consensus? You can't have both.

Having made these assertions, I would like to add an important consideration which we became aware of, but did not explicitly study in the research project mentioned. It would be an oversimplification to say that the situation regarding consensus-dissensus simply mechanically determines the change strategy involved. This leads me to my eleventh point, namely:

11. Strategies of change are, themselves, a dynamic in the consensus-dissensus situation. It is in the very nature of human interaction that each party responds to his conception of the situation, as influenced in part by the prior response of the other parties. Thus, the way a person defines a situation, one of hostility or one of possible collaboration, may itself be a part of the situation which leads the other party to respond in a hostile or friendly manner. Thus, one's assessment of the situation as one where "We have to fight them" may turn out to be a self-fulfilling prophecy, although at that particular point an alternative behavior might have brought an alternative response.

It is this truth, of course, which makes a selection of strategies important, for the strategies themselves may affect the nature of the community

---

5. Roland L. Warren and Herbert H. Hyman, "Purposive Community Change in Consensus and Dissensus Situations," Community Mental Health Journal, Vol. 2, No. 4, Winter, 1966, p. 299.

action process. Thus, obviously, if there is opposition to a proposal, it is only rational to discover whether this opposition cannot be overcome through rational persuasion, or through bargaining, or through bringing various kinds of influence to bear. Very often, a serious conflict over a community action develops, not so much because of basic disagreement around the substantive part of the issue, as because of the way in which one or both of the parties chose to perceive the situation prematurely as a conflict situation and act accordingly. Likewise, many issues which seem to presage a fierce conflict, are found to be resolvable because of the skill and patience with which one or both of the parties persist in seeking areas of possible agreement.

Nevertheless, let us be quite clear about the point that although some dissensus situations may be resolved without conflict, this does not mean that all of them can. There may be, and often are, direct conflicts of interest, or of ideology, which are not resolvable through the most patient strategy, unless, of course, one side or the other is willing to give up its objective--in this case, whatever proposal for community change is involved.

We come, then, to this matter of choice of change strategies--the whole bundle of problems indicated by such questions as: Shall we work with the power structure, or fight it? Shall we work in a consensus situation with existing agencies and organizations or by-pass them? Shall we minimize differences with our opponents, or shall we build them up into major issues? Do we have a chance of persuading them to support, or at least not oppose, our proposal? What kinds of resources do we have, to collaborate with? What kinds of resources do we have, to bargain with? What kinds of resources do we have, to fight with? What resources do the other parties have? How can we change their resources or ours?

We all know that community development workers are asking themselves such questions today. There are a number of reasons for this. One is that they are under attack for not being more effective. They are under attack by different parties for different reasons. Another is that many community development workers, themselves, are coming to the conviction that the old-fashioned way of seeking consensus just simply doesn't get enough done, rapidly enough, to keep pace with the mounting social problems. Another, closely allied, is this matter of system maintenance and system change, and the growing belief that major changes are necessary, something different from merely an expansion of existing programs or a more effective coordination of them. And of course as community development workers begin to take positions with respect to income distribution, employment opportunities, and the budgeting of large sums of public funds for this or that program, they are inexorably in the field of public policy, which, in a democracy, must mean the field of politics--which, again in a democracy, presupposes the open conflict of opposing interests and values.

12. <u>Strategies of change are related to the consensus-dissensus aspect of the proposed changes; they are related to the necessary legitimation, resources, support, and implementation; and they are related to the position of the action system within the total institutional configuration</u>. With this lengthy assertion, we reach the final point of this paper. Let us consider

some of the interrelationships involved here. First, the community change we are seeking to bring about may involve a situation of consensus or dissensus. More than likely, there will be times when we can work with certain groups within an overall consensus framework, but with others only in a context for dissensus.

Different groups may be involved in different ways. The groups from which we need legitimation may not be the group from which we need resources of money or personnel, or implementational activity. In working with and on behalf of the poor, we almost by definition have to get the money from some other group, but we must obtain the legitimation of the poor, lest they rebuff us as not being their spokesmen. The group with whom one works in an attempt to get a minor change in a basic piece of national legislation is different from the group one works with in order to get better services delivered to a slum area, or in order to develop effective and influential organizations among the poor to represent their own interests and exert political influence.

These are only examples from a whole host of possibilities, with which many of you are more familiar than I. An important thread or dimension which runs through all the possibilities, though, is the extent to which changes are sought primarily on the basis of education and persuasion and joint action, or changes are sought primarily on the basis of a contest of conflicting interests and strongly-held viewpoints. It often seems as though consensus is obtainable only on things which are old and outworn or on things which are superficial, and which dodge the main issues. How far can community development workers go, how far should they go, in entering into hotly disputed controversies on issues they consider important? Should their voice not be heard?

It would be ill-advised, at the end of this long paper, to go into a detailed analysis of the relationship of change strategies to the position of the individual change agent, or his agency, in the socio-economic structure of the community. But I should like to comment, at least, that it would seem useless to discuss the desirability of alternative change strategies without taking this into account. And I should like to add the corollary that it may not be advisable for an organization to attempt to use all the possible change strategies which might effectively be employed. Perhaps something needs doing, needs doing very much, but perhaps an organization, by virtue of its position within the institutional structure, and its other goals, may not be a good one to do it, while organizations differing in these respects, may be in a position to do it. In short, planned change is hard enough to bring about, and it may call for many strategies both of contest and of collaboration--but this does not necessarily mean that any single organization has to use them all, or can use them all, without possibly bringing disastrous results to itself and to the objectives it is attempting to accomplish.

I have attempted to sketch out some of the backdrop against which purposive change efforts take place in our communities today, and to indicate some of the dynamics of these efforts which pose problems concerning change strategies. I have not sought to give a general answer to the question whether

consensus and relative inaction is to be preferred to change brought about through contest, for I do not believe there is an overall answer. Some situations may call for one kind of strategy, other situations another. You and I may agree on these strategies some of the time, and disagree other times. We can look to the social sciences for some illumination of the structural and processual aspects of these choices; and I do believe the social sciences are helpful, although not as much as all of us would like.

But quite aside from illumination of structural and processual aspects, there are matters of values and interests to reckon into the selection of strategies. Yours and mine may be similar on many things, different on other things. I, personally, would be miserable in a society where they were always the same, or where someone tried to tell us that they were always the same, or worse yet, tried to tell us what they must be. Short of that, you and I, and the people we interact with, must take our various stands on the important issues of our age, and on the strategies we shall employ in seeking to influence the course of events. We may achieve more reliable knowledge. But this will not relieve us from a full measure of soul searching as we choose from a number of alternatives, none of which can be completely satisfying.

The Missouri Growth Center Concept for Community Development

Hugh Denney*

In approaching this group of professionals and practitioners of the art of Community Development, the speaker is ever-mindful of the dilemma that has beset our infant profession up to this time. Knowing many of you personally, I am under no illusions that statements made this afternoon will be spontaneously accepted by this august body. However, since all previous efforts at developing workable definitions for Community Development have failed to gain acceptance, the speaker is willing to toss one more suggestion into the hopper and defend it with some vigor.

Throughout the short span of time since the emergence of Community Development as a field of work, older individuals from some of the disciplines have defined Community Development in relation to their major focus in the study of man and his environment. I, too, have been one of those who have tried to use these definitions. However, after seven years in an interdisciplinary environment at the University of Missouri, first known as the Center for Community Development and now as the Department of Regional and Community Affairs, I have gained from such a free association and vigorous interaction among colleagues the perspective which I share with you today. From the mixture of background in sociology, political science, economics, education, geography, anthropology, social work, etc., I cannot tell from what source I have derived this working definition of "community." In a forthcoming book, I have discussed this subject at great length. Today, I am prepared merely to state that to be operational and to be able to define a community, I recommend for your acceptance that a community in its smallest dimension is a place that has a name that is recorded by the United States Postal Service (or if in a foreign country by the world postal services) as the point at which all people living in a geographically defined area receive their mail. This is one thing that all people in that "community" have in common and it may well be the only thing that some people in that community share in common. People may differ in religion, and they may send their children to different schools; they may patronize different retail establishments; they may live in the city and be governed by a city council, or they may live in the open spaces and be subject to a county board; they may even be in separate states and share the same post office although this is unusual. There is in every case, however, a specific pattern of postal routes and an area that can be mapped.

---

*Associate Professor, Department of Regional and Community Affairs, The University of Missouri

and one which indicates the location of the people who share this common service.

Now if the postal service area is a minimal dimension of community, it is obvious that for different reasons, groupings of postal units may be called communities in a larger sense. Some people consider a county as a community because they have a common interest in the county government. Others consider that the three digit zip code zones constitute communities. Personally, I would prefer to call these by some other name and leave the single postal service unit with a specific name for a specific area of service. I am sure that this will not suit some of my colleagues with specialized disciplinary backgrounds, but I challenge those of you who do disagree not only to define community if you cannot accept this definition, but to locate a community so others may see it and find out where it starts and stops and what it is that makes it a community. With this arbitrary definition of an area of work, I would like to proceed further to the concept that if we will accept the smallest postal service area as the minimal point of work--one which can be named and located with a five-cent stamp by anybody in the United States--then we must find how the people in this small postal area align themselves into successively larger orders of communities, areas, or regions so that they may achieve through common effort those services, institutions, and programs which cannot be obtained in the very smallest postal unit.

I have chosen to refer to this as the growth center concept for Community Development. If you want to quarrel, I will change it to the growth center concept for Area Development and accept that the area is a cluster of communities.

Putting aside the debate over definition and determination of boundaries which I have just covered, I would like to bring out a few essential points relative to growth centers and to our young profession. I am keenly aware from my association with Mr. Arthur Dunham, a long-time member of the University of Michigan staff, that communities to him and many others are essentially face-to-face gatherings of people for common endeavor. I have often discussed this definition with him in relation to the growth center concept and Mr. Dunham has agreed that larger areas of work are necessary, but he is unwilling to call them communities. I do not care to belabor this point, but what I do care to share with you is the firm conviction that we cannot in the late twentieth century practice our art in a vacuum or only in the microcosm of face-to-face community settings--either in this country or in the underdeveloped emerging nations of the world. Rather, we must find a means by which, beginning with two persons, we can expand the method and the process of sharing views, observations, judgments, and decisions and still take into account the larger segments of society which in the interdependent world that we live in, will not permit us to go about our own business in our own little backyards oblivious to society as a whole. At every turn we are beset by the fact that what others do beyond our small group's control determine the limits of our own activities and can produce successes or failures in spite of our small groups or communities. It is to this end then that I, over a long period of time, have tried to find a pattern that will permit the

identification of the linkages between the very small community and the larger segments of society. And while it remains to be seen whether this concept is a universal or one that applies only to the western two-thirds of America, I am satisfied at this time that it does apply to a vast area of the United States and will stand close inspection by you and your cohorts.

The Growth Center Concept is based fundamentally upon the concept that people are territorial animals; that they, like other elements of nature, abhor a vacuum; and that they have tried to infiltrate, occupy, and manage all the space on the surface of the earth. Limited by environmental conditions in some cases, encouraged in others--all the efforts of man throughout recorded history have led to the establishment of central points, central places of service for the common good, most of which have achieved the distinction of a name in the postal service registry. These become, in my opinion, legally definable units of community--they have a name and they have a dimension of service. True, this dimension may vary with the change of times, and some may disappear just as human beings change and pass on, but when a community and the postal unit disappears, the people left behind are added to another community and continue to receive that common service uninterrupted. So they are still a part of the living vine, at least in the postal sense.

It is inconceivable that in a democracy based upon representative government we should not also accept representative participation in community and area development. While it would be fine if every person old and young, rich and poor, could meet in a town hall to discuss common problems, consider alternatives, make decisions, and carry out actions, it is a fact of life that 190 million Americans cannot do this. We may substitute television, radio, newspapers, and mass meetings, but we cannot reach decisions on this scale in this manner.

In view of this, I suggest we accept Community Development at this lowest level in the postal service unit as a place to maximize participation of individuals. Having maximized participation of individuals in this lowest rank of community, we should then call upon them to select from among their groups representatives of their own who could at the next higher level of community or area represent their views to those representing other communities of a like nature. Thus, the shared views of the problems that may be common to some or all of those assembled may be exposed to alternative solutions and decisions made for the common good. The representatives from the community may then return to their local areas and present the suggested actions for consideration.

The pattern by which representatives of these postal service units are brought together is in initial stage determined by the distance to the nearest larger community which performs services not available in the original postal area. The selection of these centers is essentially a matter of recognizing within any distance range the next larger community that best serves this function. The people living in these areas already have elevated from amongst their individual postal areas one or more communities to positions of greater service through the transfer of their dollar patronage in the retail trades and services. These cities have also obtained the better highways, the better

schools, and the communication and information networks through which small communities relate to the larger society. The methodology which I will now describe permits the selection of these communities from existing census data, and by the application of simple geometric tools the approximate boundaries of shared interest may be ascertained. [1] Although this method appears to be a purely theoretical overlay on the landscape, careful study and testingof the principles involved in your communities will, I believe, convince even the skeptics of a high degree of applicability of the theory to practice. I fully recognize that administrators of government agencies and local government officials may at first glance shy away from the idea of sharing a study with the next larger city in order to derive a solution of common problems for the area, but our experience in Missouri indicates that given time to study the situation they will take advantage of the opportunity and will rally around the center. If proper educational insights are brought to bear, they will not only accept but will demand accelerated planning and development on an area basis so that all parts may be enhanced by group action. The techniques referred to in the selection of these centers for aggregating the small postal unit communities is a very simple one. Given any state or territory, the communities are ranked in hierarchical order from the largest population downward according to intervals. By using symbols on a map, a series of circles is inscribed delineating the time-distance range acceptable for the level of service which the center is expected to perform.

Studies by many independent researchers have revealed a strong affinity for a one-hour maximum travel pattern with considerable resistance developing after a forty-five minute range is exceeded. Individual studies of commuting patterns to work and to trading centers indicates that in the short run many people will commute more than one hour, but over a period of a year or more the commuter will either find a job closer to home or move to the new location.

In those areas in which the total population is declining, it is possible to find within an hour's range some community which is continuing to grow as the loyalties and patronage in the surrounding communities are transferred to that center. On the other hand, when an area is increasing in total population --and when a certain density is reached--a new center of service will emerge normally near the equi-distance boundary. This new center may in time warrant full treatment as a center of service by virtue of the expanding population and the demand for services on a shorter time-distance scale.

To establish a population criteria for a hierarchial pattern of growth centers, I have found it necessary to develop a rigorous adherence to the geometric progression scale. If we begin with one person and continue to double through twenty-five degrees, we can cover all of the population agglomerations from the New York standard metropolitan statistical area down to the individual.

---

1. A map presentation accompanied the following discussion. Additional information on the material described here may be obtained from Mr. Denney.

With respect to the distance factor, if we begin with one mile and double until we have reached fifteen degrees of doubling, we would reach the point at which New York City serves as the world city with a range of 16,384 plus miles of effective reach. The maps which I have here indicate the successively smaller patterns which emerge as this technique is applied to North America, and some preliminary tests indicate it applies to the Philippine Islands and perhaps to the rest of the world.

Thus, if we begin with the North American continent, we find New York City serving the entire continent (as well as being a world city) at a 4,096-mile radius; at a 2,048-mile radius we find Los Angeles springing into the picture; at the 1,024-mile radius Chicago and Denver emerge as the principle service centers spatially located to achieve major positions of service in the future. Continuing to break this down into still smaller levels of service, we find at the 512-mile pattern such important cities as Seattle, Houston, Atlanta, Miami, Minneapolis, etc., appear. At the 256-mile scale, we find 49 principle cities in America. I will spare you the arithmetic, but say that this continues downward through the 128 to 64, to 32, to 16, to 8, and to the 4-mile radius. It is becoming difficult in the midlands of America to find the two-mile and the one-mile settlements, but they do exist in the populated east, in the populated west and in the suburban areas of all cities.

It appears that throughout much of mid-America, especially in the east-north central states, the distance scale that represents the growth areas of today is strongly related to a thirty-two-mile radius whereas in the western plains, the sixty-four-mile radius is more in vogue. Maps have been drawn on this level for all the contiguous states, and I invite any researcher to take these criteria and apply them to any locality in any state. When the densely settled areas of the East and West Coast are studied, it is apparent that the increased population density permits the maintenance of services of a high level at more frequent intervals because numbers of people take precedence over distance when the maximum of a one-hour range is satisfied. But again, the mere fact that large populations exist and traffic becomes congested leads to a slow-down in the rate of movement which takes place in the central city for the masses of people. Thus, we find the distance scale working backwards in the heavily populated areas, for no matter how fast intercity trains may run or cars may go, the pattern of service calls for the restoration of major shopping centers at the sixteen, the eight, the four, the two, and even the one-mile spacings in the metropolitan areas of our country.

This, in abbreviated form, is the concept of growth centering and linkages between centers of different magnitudes that I commend to you in your search for a handle to begin to link the individual in the small community into the chain of human society. This provides a systematic method by which we may minimize the distance that anyone may have to go for services and at the same time improve the efficiency with which we may provide those services by recognizing that the concentrations of people and the location factors play a major role in man's ability to enjoy the fruits of science in a modern technology. Strengthening these growth centers by clustering

governmental services will permit the maintenance of high level services across the country and reduce to some degree the necessity for continuously shifting population that adds to problems in central cities while creating other problems in the towns from which they have moved.

I realize that this has been a limited treatment of a subject which requires much more time to cover thoroughly, but I hope that I have given you the fundamentals of a pattern of interrelationships between communities beginning with the smallest postal unit and progressing upward to the great cities of the world like New York City. I will be interested in your reactions both today and in correspondence which I anticipate may develop.

Thank you.

Making Community Development Operational

J. Carroll Bottum*

Go to any community today, rural or urban, and ask the people what are their problems, and they will name more often their group problems rather than their individual problems. There is need today for some objective, educational institution to serve these needs. It might be a university, a foundation, or an institution created by the state. There is much justification for it being a university with its many sources of information and its history of educational objectivity.

However, we must recognize that it costs time and effort to be informed on community matters. Not all people are concerned sufficiently to pay that cost. Therefore, certain issues are decided by a limited number of people in every community with the sanction of the others. On certain other broad issues, many people may need to be informed. Therefore, educational programs must be geared to recognize this situation.

Community development may be involved only in helping committees to carry out more effectively whatever activities certain groups are sponsoring or may desire to sponsor; or it may be involved in determining what should be the goals of the community, what are the fundamental problems, and what should be the priorities in the problems attacked in the community. To my way of thinking, if community development is to progress and move ahead on a sound basis it must be involved with this latter group of questions. If it is, this involves some kind of a committee.

Definition of Community Resource Development

People have different definitions for community resource development which is natural at this stage of community resource development. However, if we are to make the most progress, we need to agree basically on what activity we are discussing even though we may use slightly different terms to describe it.

I should like to define the objective of community resource development as an effort to increase the economic opportunity and the quality of living of a given community through helping the people of that community with those problems that require group decision and group action.

The terms "economic opportunity and quality of living" are as broad in

*Assistant Head, Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University

scope and subject matter as anyone could desire. They are very inclusive. The term "with those problems that require group decision and group action" is restrictive in the sense that it rules out all problems that may be solved on an individual basis. For example, under this definition whether a county should have an education program in the wise use of credit might be a community resource development issue but the providing of an individual family with information for making a credit decision would not be a community resource development activity.

The decision to have a youth training program and how to implement it might well be community development but once it was under way it would not be considered a community development. This would be true even though the activity might be contributing greatly to the economic opportunity of the community. If an architect becomes involved in the actual construction of all the houses he plans, he soon becomes diverted from his real task.

All the activities of extension should increase the economic opportunity and quality of living of a community. Not to limit community development to group problems and group decisions would make the community development objective synonymous with the entire program of extension.

Objectives of Community Resource Development

Community resource development is an effort to combine the body of known knowledge in the community development area with the brainpower of the community for the purpose of speeding up and improving the solving of community problems. The value judgments are rendered by leaders not the technicians. The technicians should be on tap but not on top.

These objectives rest on the premise that only the people of a community may determine what should be its goals after they have been made aware of the problems and opportunities of their particular community. It is further assumed that there is a body of knowledge and a process which can contribute to better community development.

Some will argue that the established influence leaders may tend to perpetuate the status quo. The establishment of a community development committee in no way interferes with the activities of the crusaders or other forces in a community. As the crusaders and other forces may modify the thinking of a community, the influence leaders being sensitive to the community's value and attitudes, change too. This is how they obtain and maintain their influence. They are in a position to develop workable changes and programs to carry out the less clearly defined goals of the community that may develop.

A community is usually defined as a group of people who organize for a common purpose, and in this sense an individual can belong to many communities. He may belong to one community in connection with the primary school for his children, another from the standpoint of taxes, another where he trades, another from the standpoint of his cultural center, and so on. Thus, a community may be large or small in geographic area depending upon the community function involved.

There are exogenous and endogenous forces affecting every community. Both of these have to be taken into consideration in community development. The central focus is economic opportunity and quality of living for the people for a particular community.

To solve certain problems the power may rest within the given community. For other problems the community may have only the influence that that particular community holds in relation to the total community that must make the decision which may be a region, a state, or even the nation.

The educator's role in community development involves helping a community to identify broadly and define its goals. He helps the community identify and rate the importance of various problems in attaining its goals. He helps the community put the problem in a decision-making framework. He develops new alternatives for the community by inventing new arrangements or institutions to take care of new situations. He helps the community measure the cost and benefits of each alternative. He helps the community in its strategy in carrying out its objectives after they choose the approach they wish to use.

In one community an action group happened to take on the responsibility of building a hospital. They were highly successful. The next year they looked around for another project. They happened to decide the city needed a new city hall. Their program was unsuccessful and the same group became frustrated. The hospital was a high priority item in the minds of the people of the community but not the city hall. The cost-benefit ratio was not favorable to very many.

Another community wanted to launch a better forage program because the farmers were turning their dairy cows out to pasture in the corn stalks in the winter. An analysis showed that if the farmers wanted to make the most income, and they did, they should continue to grow corn and get rid of the dairy cows.

Many groups are ready to champion a cause. The real gap in our communities is the making of an analysis of the community's problems and opportunities, the crystallizing of opinion based on sound analysis, setting priorities and developing workable alternatives as a basis for communities to make rational decisions. Successful corporations have divisions to analyze and set forth alternative opportunities for their board of directors. Successful communities require so much technical information and are so much affected by trends and developments that they need some way to combine the technicians with the influence leaders to do the same thing that happens in well run corporations.

The problem of community development is both similar and dissimilar to farm and home development. It is similar in that one is attempting to organize the community in such a way as to provide the maximum satisfaction for the people just as one attempts to organize the farm and home to provide the maximum satisfactions. It is similar in the sense that one is attempting to improve the efficiency of each community enterprise and to carry it to the point where the marginal satisfactions of each community activity is equal, the same as in a farm where each enterprise is carried to the point where the

marginal returns are equal. It is dissimilar in the nature of the problems involved and in the fact that many individuals are involved instead of those in one family.

Identifying Leaders

In individual farm and home planning, one is dealing with a family. In community development, all the people in the community are involved. Therefore, one family cannot make the decisions and neither can all the people in the community be involved in the planning process. Thus, the selection of a group of individuals to analyze the problems of a community becomes an important problem. We feel that the process we are using to select such a committee is working satisfactorily. The analyses may be taken to all the people but they cannot all participate in the analysis.

In Indiana we have used the methods suggested by a number of sociologists for locating the influence leaders. In a county we first ask the extension council or board to invite in representatives from each of the localities and cities to meet with the extension committee for the purpose of naming thirty or forty of what they consider are the leaders in their county. We ask them to think of people who are leaders in the various areas such as government, education, religion, culture, business, farming, conservation, and youth work.

These people are then visited and asked two questions: (1) what do they see as the problems facing the county, and (2) who are five broad-minded, dedicated, respected individuals who are sensitive to the community's values whom the interviewees would like to see on such a community development committee.

Let me say at this point that I would not argue for the county as the unit for setting up of a committee. The unit may be a trade center of several counties or the unit may be less than a county in size. It just happens that we decided to use the county as a unit for starting our program in Indiana. Time and experience will tell which is the most desirable geographical unit under the various circumstances.

In this first named list certain individuals tend to stand out by being suggested more often than others. The twenty to forty individuals not on the first list, but named most often by the first group interviewed, are then visited and asked the same two questions. From the individuals named most often by the two groups of fifty to eighty people, the community development committee is selected. It is usually composed of fifteen to twenty individuals. The committee is kept open-ended so that an individual may drop off at any time or a new individual may be added.

These committees tend to be largely men; perhaps two or three women may show up on such a committee. We have wondered, because men were working on this project, if it had any influence on the selection of the committee members. So, in certain counties we have had the home demonstration agent help with the interviews, but we have come out in the same way. This seems to be in about the proportion that women participate politically.

Beal and Bohlen found about the same number of women being named to such committees in Iowa.

Most of these individuals named to the committee tend to be middle-aged and older. People seem to be inclined to select proven individuals in the community. They have usually been successful in their profession or their business. They tend to be broad-minded and tolerant. They are not of the dramatic crusader type. We have found that not over one person per county selected in this manner has refused to serve on such a committee. They understand before they are asked to serve on the committee by what process they are selected. We believe this is an important factor in their willingness to serve because they are all busy people.

The average interview with these leaders requires about one hour, and so far both someone from the university and somebody from the county staff have gone together in making these interviews. Some have felt this was not an efficient process. However, we believe in the early stages in community development that this has been an important factor: first, because the leader took more seriously the visitation when it involved both the county staff and someone from the university; and second, it provided a wonderful opportunity for both individuals to understand what the people thought were the problems of the county. One of the surprises has been the people named to these committees. About one-half to two-thirds has been people that you might expect to be selected. However, another one-third to one-half has tended to be what some people call the silent leader. There have been individuals that would not have been selected even if they had been chosen by a very capable committee.

The committee works quietly and without fanfare. It identifies problems, puts them in a decision-making framework, reaches a consensus, and then attempts to bring about changes by working informally with the organizations or agencies involved. If no organization is involved with the problem being considered the committee may attempt to set up an action committee to deal with the problem. The analyses may be taken to all the people in the community but all the people cannot participate in the original analysis.

This is the way we believe these influence leaders have gained their positions of influence. We do not want them nor do they wish to be cast in the role of crusaders. We consider this group more of a study group and a catalyst group in the community.

The citizens of every community want certain functions or activities performed for them such as: activities that will raise the per capita income, provide protection, health, education, transportation, communication, government, religion, recreation, and culture. When a change is contemplated in any one of these, the committee wants to know the different ways open to them for reaching the desired end. They want to know the monetary and non-monetary cost and benefits. They want to know which costs and benefits are private and which are public. Not only do they want to know the costs and benefits but upon whom they will fall in the community. It is the function of the technical people serving the committee to help obtain this data and to put it in a decision-making framework.

We believe community development committees regardless of how they are selected should not have legal power. Such power often gets them into difficulty and defeats the very purpose for which they are established.

Finally, because community development programs have been so closely associated with the public affairs programs, I should like to differentiate between them. In community development, the objective is to aid the community or area to develop, using every available resource including the local, state, and national institutions and agencies already established. At a certain stage of this development, a modification of an existing institution may appear beneficial. This, then, may result in a public affairs issue. Therefore, public affairs issues may arise from community or area development activities. They may also arise from other sources. Community or area development usually deals with a total program for a particular area while public affairs programs usually deal with a particular issue. They are closely interrelated but are not one and the same.

Community development properly conducted can aid in accomplishing four things: (1) reduce the lag in community adjustments, (2) increase the efficiency with which our community affairs are conducted, (3) involve the citizens of the community in a more realistic decision-making way with their public problems, and (4) solve a higher proportion of the community's problems locally.

Students, Schools, Service, and Society--A New Mix

Joseph G. Colmen*

These are exciting times in education. Education is now a growth industry. It is as much a part of the contemporary culture as the corporation, and shares headlines with war, crime, and baseball. It has become exciting, both to the people who work in it, and hopefully to the students who are subjected to it. There are ferment and innovation; psychological alarm at costs along with greater financial support; and critiques and defenses about everything from computer assisted instruction of preschoolers to the effect of racial isolation on student achievement to the balance of teaching versus research at the graduate level. Most exciting of today's dialogues, however, concerns the role of the school and the student in the changing processes of society.

Early debaters were sharply divided in their views of the role of the educational system as a participant in social change. The "four-walls" concept presented the school as an isolate, detached from the outside world by a curriculum curtain that was the fabrication of and the province of the educationist. Except for occasional forays by educational analysts or well-intended PTA groups schools were free of outside influence, for they knew best how to educate our youngsters and for what. On the other hand, faced with society's festering sores, recently exposed to an angry nation and world, another group took to question whether or not the schools really knew (1) how to educate, but more important, (2) for what to educate. This group asked whether or not the school should be part of the community in a practical-working, as opposed to a theoretical-academic, sense.

Colleges in an Ecological System

How do schools fit into their communities as social and cultural systems? Shouldn't a school or college see itself as part of a larger ecological system in which it fosters everything from social welfare to urban rehabilitation? If so, James Perkins, President of Cornell, charges that "We have not been very inventive about how to relate studies and experience or thought and action, and the result can be frustration, or apathy, or even revulsion on the part of good students." Relate that statement to Berkeley, Howard, CUNY and, to a less visible degree, hundreds of other campuses.

---

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Some institutions today, such as a college being established as part of a newly forming city called Columbia, about midway between the creeping metropolises of Washington and Baltimore, are seeking for a design which will train people for involvement in the dynamics of social process.

Several weeks ago, Buell Gallagher, President of New York City University, served notice that his 120 year-old municipal institution was ready--in fact, eager--to come down from its ivory tower. He asked the city's Board of Education to let the college operate five public schools in Harlem so it could demonstrate how community and university cooperation could lead to improved education for the youngsters. He might well have added that it could lead to improved education for the college student as well, much as the Peace Corps has shown that the period of work and service abroad is as much a learning experience for the Volunteer as it is an education and aid to those he serves.

Colleges and universities are thus taking a new look at their purposes and at the roles of their faculty, administrators, and students. And they are asking whether or not they can achieve in the university a sense of community, in which the process of learning is not limited to the academic experience but rather is part of the total living, working, and playing experience of the college, the community, the nation, the world.

A new identity is, in fact, beginning to be assumed by the colleges; an emerging public role of the university in American life. The complex demands of a specializing society, in which new knowledge is a critical factor of growth, have found the university sought after more than ever before to help in research, training, and consultation on problems of economic and social development both at home and abroad. The modern university is beginning to involve itself in the function of social participation along with its historic mission of observer and critic of public affairs. Forms of social participation, including ways of guarding against becoming an agency merely performing random tasks assigned by the federal government, are now being assessed by universities throughout the nation. Whatever the outcome of this assessment, it is reasonable to expect that the future mission of the public universities, if not the private universities, will include much more emphasis upon the broad concept of public service as a base for educating students, for research, and for resolution of which we may refer to as an identity crisis.

One might also anticipate that this change in the outlook and mission of the universities will affect the academic curriculum to the extent that, more and more, the academic classroom will not be bound by space but will be projected throughout the world via television, actual study groups, or working parties moving to the "action," wherever it may be found.

Students and Social Change

So much for the university as an evolving institution in terms of its interface with the world around it.

College students today are searching for real world educative experiences which will test theory in practice and will permit inductive development

of new theoretical formulations in their chosen fields of study. Unlike the students of the '50's, the so-called silent generation or apathetic conformists, they are looking for ways to contribute directly to the solution of society's significant problems. Dissatisfied with the world as handed to them by their parents, they seek innovative, dyramic solutions based on new sets of premises. But their opportunities are limited.

Father Theodore Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame University, says, "There is something a little sick about the present system of higher education. Looking at its total spectrum, all the way from lower education through the Ph.D. and post-doctoral, I think it might best be described in the favorite adjective of modern students--'unreal'..." "We put people in this thing almost as participants in an oriental dance, where they go through all these motions and yet learn very little about themselves or the world they live in, or about other people, although they may learn a great deal in this amorphous area we call 'cognitive.'"

Jacqueline Grennan, President of Webster College, adds that "Learning is not essentially expository, but exploratory. It happens out in the world of action, a new ecumenical world of search. This search has led many young people into protest and many more into such public service as the Peace Corps, VISTA, American Friends Service Committee and Papal Volunteers."

Harold Taylor, former President of Sarah Lawrence College, challenges that "In the past, the student has been considered an unavoidable element in the educational process, more to be coped with than to be treated as a responsible young adult. We have fallen short of making the call for service into a philosophy of education for a democratic society." This view may be shifting as a plan of national service for all Americans, male and female, is debated and shaped. One observer of the national scene believes that "national service will not come in a single big legislative push but in a series of small developments... "Some see it as an extension of the present system of compulsory education... It is not just a matter of helping the poor: the middle class youth, tired of his car and his clothes, is discerned to be badly in need of a sense of commitment."

The need is present for a massive expansion of opportunity for college students to express this sense of commitment, to be participants in and architects of the experientially hastened social change here and abroad. As Harold Taylor goes on to say, "The world recognizes citizens and leaders who can tolerate ambiguity and who are not perplexed by paradox... Demands must be made on schools and colleges to produce graduates who can cope effectively with confusing situations, which have no <u>one</u> best solution (and often seemingly no one <u>good</u> solution." "...in such ambiguous situations as peace and war, human rights, the politics of change and the reform of education." If this is so, the world, in addition to the classroom, must be their laboratory.

While only a relative handful of students currently are participating in truly worthwhile community service programs, it is likely that many more would participate if a formal program, structured within the university, were

made available. Such a program would offer various experiences in public service for students wishing to participate.

Human-public Service Manpower Needs

At the same time that universities are pondering their meaning in a new and changing social order and students are searching for their place in that order, a great manpower demand, particularly in the public service, or more broadly human service, sector of our society is about to submerge us. A study by Herman Neibuhr, Assistant to the President of Temple University for Urban Affairs (note his title), projects a shortage of four million such workers by 1972, just to meet demands already on the books, in fields like health, education, welfare, justice, city planning, urban administration, housing, transportation, and the like. One of the most important but less discussed brakes on Great Society programs has been the lack of qualified manpower at the federal, state, local, and private levels. Employment in the public sector is expected to expand still more as society makes more demands for services. The need is therefore evident for ways to bring into human service fields more trained manpower.

If the colleges and universities would create systems for providing integrated human service learning and work experiences for students, it is likely that many of those students, testing themselves against the pragmatic reality of such work, would opt for careers in these fields. This statement is supported by evidence from Peace Corps research which shows that college graduates from both liberal arts and technical professional persuasions more frequently switch their career choices after Peace Corps service to human service fields than vice versa. Thus, colleges and universities have within themselves the capacity to produce a larger supply of needed human service manpower than they might otherwise by providing opportunity for meaningful service as part of the educational process.

Public Service Training

From the foregoing analysis, it is a short step to see how the needs of colleges, students, and society come together in one focal concept: that of education cum work-service. That step, it seems to me, is establishment of a College-Public Service Training program which eventually would consist of units in most of the colleges and universities of the nation.

The Program

The program for College-Public Service Training recognizes that many college students will not be able, for reasons of finance, interests, or obligations, to engage in public service activities once out of school. But while in school, they have time, idealism, need to test themselves in a variety of situations, and frequently uncertainty about what they might do with their lives. The program would be conducted at junior colleges, colleges, and

universities wishing to affiliate. Though participation of institutions and students would be voluntary, we believe that students themselves would exert pressure at many institutions to create a College-Public Service Training program.

The program would engage students in an integrated process of seminars, workshops, and practical service activity, either during the school term or on vacation periods.

Special courses and seminars would be designed in blocks around the interests, aptitudes, and abilities of the particular students, and the kinds of service activities available in the program. Registration in the program might provide academic credit, if the institution so desired. Faculty for the academic positions might preferably be recruited from off-campus agencies and organizations. Courses would not duplicate those given as part of the regular curriculum. Instead, the program would attempt to develop practical skills around the theory of the regular courses and prepare members for the actual working assignment. In addition, they would serve an integrative function in cutting across departmental or disciplinary lines, as for example in work on social change or community development.

Students in the professional schools, as well as the liberal arts, would be encouraged to participate. For example, students preparing to become lawyers might be assigned to public legal clinics for the indigent, or to a public attorney's office. The seminars for these students might be arranged by teams of teachers, including lawyers, sociologists, social psychologists, municipal judges, social workers, and others. In the field of medicine, premedical students might serve as physicians' assistants in public health clinics or hospitals. Undergraduate students in the liberal arts would be assigned according to their interests, as for example as assistants to public school teachers, social workers, the staff of local poverty programs, and in the offices of county extension agents.

The sponsoring institution would establish links for service activity with governmental or private agencies in their communities and surrounding areas, or might form consortia to provide a broader base of choice to the student. A great deal of planning, liaison, and imagination would be required to locate and arrange service activities. In some cases, students themselves might administer the program in somewhat the same manner as the splendid experiment at San Francisco State University. Private as well as public agencies would be asked to participate. Both should be eager for the assistance of interested, enthusiastic students, and the potential recruiting base they would offer.

Upon graduation, participating students might choose to go directly into public service work. They would have the advantage of directly usable experien[illegible]. Others may decide to study further for advanced degrees in fields. Students who do not elect to make a career of public service will have benefited personally from their experience and may well continue to involve themselves in genuine service activities over an entire lifetime. Their business or other activities cannot help but be influenced by this experience.

The costs to an institution for a proposed College-Public Service

Training program would be basically to establish and administer the academic portion, on the one hand, and to solicit and monitor relevant work-service opportunities for the participants on the other. A desirable adjunct might include a small hourly stipend for each student. The costs, without student stipend, would be relatively small. Students, or returned Peace Corps or VISTA Volunteers, might manage the program at nominal cost. Community organizations, public or private-voluntary, might be willing to share part of the costs, after understanding the potential recruiting advantages of the program. Some of these agencies would provide the academic faculty without cost, though a careful selection process for this critical task is essential.

There are several possible federal sources of supplementary funding which are worthy of note:

1. The College Work-Study Program next year anticipates 1,700 institutional applications. Many of these programs place students in human service activities. Last year, more than 6,000 students were involved in such activities serving Mexican Americans, American Indians, Appalachians, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, migrants, juvenile delinquents, dependent children, handicapped, aged, and prisoners. Almost 50,000 of last year's 190,000 students served in municipal, state, and non-OEO federal agencies.

Here are a few examples of their efforts:

At the California State College at Long Beach, 350 jobs were established with 16 off-campus agencies. Since a large number of the students eligible had declared a vocational goal of teaching, many worked as teacher aides in nearby local school districts. The College also has a program with a nearby Veterans' Administration Hospital where positions have been established for premedical, predental, and nursing students.

At Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh, engineering and architectural students assisted with a program developed by Action - Housing, Inc., through which residents of low-income blocks with much deteriorated housing are helped through training, technical service, and other aids to make livable and attractive their own housing and neighborhood environment. Work-Study students have also worked with United Neighborhood Houses of Allegheny County as semiprofessional advisers for citizens' committees in the preparation of proposals and designs to be submitted to the Urban Renewal Authority of Pittsburgh.

While Office of Education guidelines for College Work-Study stipulate that students selected must be in need of financial assistance, they do enable universities to develop their own programs for work opportunities for students.

The College Work-Study Program therefore provides a basis for developing work-service opportunities of the College-Public Service Training program and paying stipends to needy students.

2. Title III of the Higher Education Act provides support for "developing institutions." A developing institution is defined as one which is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative

staffs and of its student services; and is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life.

In concert with Work-Study which could pay stipends to students and costs of developing work-service opportunities, Title III could pay for the academic side of the proposed Public Service Training program. Some 300 to 400 "developing institution" applications will be supported for next year.

3. A proposed Public Service Education Act has already been introduced into the Congress. This bill would authorize experimental programs for graduate level students in certain fields, such as study combined with part-time public service.

While federal support for the College-Public Service Training program will be limited for the time being, there is a sense of urgency to establish it soon. From the point of view of the university extension interests, I see in this plan a long-needed bridge between inside and outside from which a stronger partnership with all parts of the university will emerge. As a way of entering the arena of social participation, I believe that colleges and universities have an obligation to invest some of their own resources in the plan. Employers for whom students will render services and from whose services they may expect to benefit have an obligation to support it as well. The federal government, through already existing programs, may be able to help "developing institutions" and needy students, which in combination would provide the resources for practically all of the program. Nonneedy students might participate without stipends, in the volunteer spirit of those thousands who picket, parade, and work for civil rights; tutor disadvantaged children in ghettoes and slums; and assist developing peoples in Peace Corps.

We would like in the next twelve months to see at least one great college or university in each state develop an innovative, model College-Public Service Training program. If efforts to do so prove it viable and effective, I believe more public financial support can be forthcoming.

As President Kennedy so eloquently admonished us: "...let it again demonstrate that politics and art, the life of action and the life of thought, the world of events and the world of imagination are one..."

Community Service and Continuing Education Programs under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965

Paul V. Delker*

In order to give as much information as possible in a short time about Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, I would like to organize my comments around four principal areas.

The first refers to several aspects of the history of the legislation which have an important bearing on program objectives. The second area is the administrative mechanism of Title I and how it is designed to function. Third is the operation of Title I, providing a quick factual overview and a tentative evaluation; and finally, directions for the future.

History of Title I

The earliest date that a Title I program could have started was July 1, 1966. From an operational point of view, this means Title I is ten months old. Many of you here today were involved in testifying and working for the passage of this legislation. Some of you could report far better than I on the history of this legislation. However, there is the danger that some of you who contributed to Title I may not fully understand the compromises made and the final outcome.

Title I is not a general extension bill. Like most of our legislation, Title I is a compromise. It is not exactly what any one person I have been able to identify wanted it to be. And as with all compromises, the rationale develops after the event. We now have a Title I philosophy because we have federal money supporting a Title I program.

Underlying this compromise was a skepticism by some members of Congress of higher education's ability to respond to community problems. Some members of Congress do not think you will get out into communities and solve some of their problems As a result of this skepticism, Title I does not support pure research. It supports only action research which is part of a community service program.

Also, because it is a compromise, Title I is an extremely free piece of legislation, directionally speaking. In the area of community service, Title I allows almost any activity. This presents a great opportunity: a great

---

*Director, Community Services and Continuing Education Programs, U.S. Office of Education

opportunity to serve and an even greater opportunity to articulate a philosophy of service on the part of higher education.

Administrative Mechanism of Title I

Title I was presented to Congress as a necessary mechanism for applying the total resources of higher education toward the solution of community problems. Congress passes legislation by identifying a problem or a crisis and then turning to that part of our established system which can best meet this crisis. The crisis which produced Title I is the crisis of living in urban America. How do we learn to live in an urban society? How do we extend our present systems in order to meet this problem?

In 1965 there were six riots in our cities and in 1966 there were thirty-eight. In 1967 riots have already begun. If riots continue to occur at this rate we can expect sixty times the problem ten years from now. We must find ways to live in our urban society. Seventy-five per cent of our people live on less than 1 per cent of the land. Those of you who are not from highly urbanized states must not overlook the fact that the country as a whole must deal with urban problems. Higher education through cooperative extension programs effectively met the needs of the people when we were an agrarian economy. Congress was finally pursuaded that we should have a mechanism to apply the resources of higher education to an urban society, and this is the mission of Title I.

Title I requires the designation or creation of new state agencies. These are not simply channels for dispensing funds as so many state agencies are, but are new mechanisms designed to meet new responsibilities. These new responsibilities as articulated in the Act are to produce a comprehensive, coordinated, and state-wide system of community service programs. No organization in any state has ever been charged with that responsibility before.

The state governors have selected existing organizations to discharge this new responsibility. In twenty-six states, state universities are the administrative agencies. In twenty-one states, state boards or commissions of higher education have been designated. In three states the State Agency is the State Department of Education. In three other states, state departments such as the Office of State and Regional Planning and Community Development have been designated. These state agencies must create a new community between higher education and those engaged in community service. They must bring together groups which traditionally have not had the opportunity or desire to communicate. Higher education has traditionally been concerned with teaching and research. People in community service have been concerned with the immediate problems of daily life such as unemployment, bad housing, and government. I want to describe in some detail to what extent this new community has functioned in the past ten months.

The State Agencies have two functions: the function of identifying community problems and the function of programming solutions to these problems. These functions can only be effectively accomplished when state agencies work together with universities and community service groups.

Most of the state agencies designated have now participated in the Title I program for two fiscal years. In fiscal year 1966 only five states had one community problem area designated in their state plans. At the other extreme six states identified eight to eleven broad community problem areas in their fiscal year 1966 state plans. I don't have a completed statistical analysis but this suggests a bell-shaped curve with a small group at each end. Most of the remaining participating states identified four to five problem priorities from a variety of problem areas.

Twenty states, about two-fifths, retained the same number of problem priorities in both years; thirteen identified fewer priorities in 1967 than in 1966; fifteen identified more priorities. Five states identified the same problem areas, though not necessarily with the same emphasis, for both years. Ten states made one change, addition or deletions. Nineteen states identified a completely different set of problem priorities.

Of programs funded in fiscal year 1966 approximately half have been completed. We have only a fragmented report for fiscal year 1967 since many programs have not yet been activated. I cannot tell you what 1967 is going to produce. I can only talk about what 1966 appears to have produced.

Out of fiscal 1966 funds 301 institutions of higher education received money under Title I. Of these, 168 were four-year public institutions; 89 were four-year private institutions; 35 were two-year public institutions; and 9 were two-year private institutions. Private institutions as a group represented 33 per cent of the total. It is both pleasing and surprising that so many private institutions were able to participate in the first year.

Categorized into the problem areas of the legislation, programs funded through these 301 institutions break down this way. By far the largest area of programming was in government training. Programs were conducted for municipal, county, and state government personnel. A total of $3,114,000, or 37 per cent of Title I funds, were expended in this area in 1966. In terms of numbers of programs, out of a total 548 programs, government accounted for 161 or 29 per cent. Programs in the area of poverty received $1,312,400 or 16 per cent of Title I program funds; health $1,071,900 or 13 per cent; recreation $474,600 or 6 per cent, and employment $250,000 or 3 per cent of the total.

Looking at recreation and employment in terms of numbers of programs rather than funds, they account for a significantly higher proportion of the total. Seventeen per cent of the programs were in the recreation field, 10 per cent in employment.

What I find significant about this rather hazy picture is what I like to call in modern terminology a "happening." I joined the Office of Education as director of the new branch in May, 1966 and by June 30, forty-nine state plans were approved and funded. This was possible only because under Title I, the states are required to determine their own problems and their own priorities. There literally was no federal influence. We had neither time, staff, nor opportunity to tell those of you who initiated the program what we thought you ought to do. To be honest, there was little more state influence than federal influence. State agencies had been designated but they were primarily

channels for assuring that federal funds would be received. Programming consisted largely of calling together state institutional representatives and presenting them with the new legislation. After a few hours of brainstorming, the institutional representatives wrote their proposals and the state agency wrote a state plan to accommodate them. I don't feel any compulsion to apologize for this process. If we are serious about creative federalism and about making the states responsible for their own problems, as Title I is, we have to begin the dialogue by listening to the states. Title I has done that.

Some of what was produced was of poor quality, but at least we can deal with it. Some programs were very good. One of the most encouraging happenings occurred in Tulsa, Oklahoma. A program imaginatively entitled "Professors of the City," involves four institutions in the state of Oklahoma: Oklahoma State, University of Oklahoma, University of Tulsa, and Langston University. Five professors direct the program. They form an interdisciplinary team of sociologists, educators, political scientists, and so forth. They are physically located in Tulsa and their purpose is to go into the poverty areas to meet with and help the citizens identify the problems in their neighborhoods; to inform them about available resources as an interdisciplinary team to bear on the problem. When these are insufficient, they can draw on the four participating institutions for additional resources.

The reason I select this program is that it is a new concept in applying the resources of higher education toward the solution of community problems. Traditionally institutions have seen their role in terms of undergraduate education. Their community service activities were largely limited to producing leaders in our society. Title I does call for something else. We don't really know yet how to go about applying the total resources of higher education to the complex urban society in which we live. "Professors of the City" does provide a new concept in this attempt.

I also want to talk about some of the discouraging problems that have been revealed by the happenings of 1966. One of the greatest difficulties from the point of view of the Washington office is that programs are not related to any identified community problem. Title I does require identification of community problems. It is not a continuing education bill. One of the problems we have is what I call the continuing education syndrome, which says: "I want Title I money to put on a new course."

Another problem is the academic connoisseur who says in his own proposal: "I want money to do what I please. Please be my source." Of course, I am taking extreme examples of things that have happened. But in so many cases there is no clear statement of program objectives. If you cannot tell me what are the objectives of your program for X thousand dollars I wonder what kind of program you are going to conduct. Frequently the stated objectives are not related to the community problems identified and this raises questions about whether the real resources of the institutions are being applied to the designated problem. If you don't know what it is you are trying to do, then how do you know what faculties of your institution should be involved?

There are two more areas of abuse I want to share with you. Both are very understandable, but they illustrate an educational need in relation to

Title I as a program. The proposal which is primarily designed as a learning experience for undergraduates is not difficult to understand because it is in keeping with the tradition of higher education. The good teacher is concerned with the development of his students. When he makes application for federal funds the development of his students is often his primary objective. When Dr. Coleman described the various parts of federal legislation devoted to undergraduates and suggested some innovative new approaches, you notice he did not include Title I. Title I has only two major restrictions. One is that the program be related to identify community problems; the other is that it is for adults whose education has been completed or interrupted. You are generally conceded by federal legislation to be an adult at eighteen, but if you are an undergraduate between eighteen and twenty-one or a graduate student between the usual ages of twenty-one and twenty-five you are not considered to be an adult whose education has been completed or interrupted. When such a population is involved in Title I programs we feel compelled to ask for special justification of why this is the best population to perform the community service.

Another is that programs submitted to state agencies are sometimes designed to solve institutional problems rather than community problems. Curriculum development for dropouts is one example. I know dropouts can be a community problem, but developing a curriculum for dropouts so they won't drop out is an institutional problem. There are other funds and other energies which can be devoted to such programs. Title I was not conceived to serve the undergraduate population or to solve institutional problems.

Underlying both these problems is a reluctance on the part of higher education to get involved in the community. I think we all understand some of the sources of this reluctance and we are not surprised that it creates barriers to effective community service.

Directions for the Future

Finally, I would like to spend a few minutes on our directions for the future. In terms of legislative prospects the President's budget requests $16.5 million for fiscal year 1968. Neither you nor I am entirely happy with that figure but we must not overlook the fact that it represents a 65 per cent increase at a time when many federal programs are being held to last year's level of funding, or below. Two amendments have been introduced before Congress. The first would continue the matching fund requirement of 75 per cent federal and 25 per cent nonfederal for fiscal years 1968 and 1969; 50 per cent matching would be required in fiscal year 1970. This same amendment will extend the legislative life of Title I five years beyond 1968, through 1973.

The other amendment requests authorization to use up to 10 per cent of Title I funds for direct grants by the Commissioner of Education to programs which are of regional interest or significance. At present every Title I program must fit within the problem area priorities of a given state plan. There are regional problems which cannot be funded because they don't fit into the priorities of all the states involved. This other amendment would provide

money for special projects whose results would be shared with and benefit all the states.

In terms of prospects for the future, I think you sense the importance I attach to state agencies in the Title I program. I think you should understand, either as state representatives or as institutional representatives dealing with state agencies, the kind of pressure you are going to get from our office in the future. We will be asking for greater and greater specificity in terms of identification of community problems and program direction. We are committed to this.

The first paragraph of the dialogue with the states is recorded and now it is our turn. This is what we are saying: "Tell me what your problems are, what system you are using to help identify priorities and what kind of data you have. I don't mind if the data is not the best. Acknowledge it for what it is and make the best identification possible."

Let me describe a significant 1967 program which was reported to us by the state of California. It involves $192,019 of California's $549,393 allocation. It is a comprehensive, coordinated, and state-wide program for training government employees. The nine campuses of the University of California have submitted one program and only one program under Title I. They have identified their campuses as nine regional centers for training county, municipal, and local government officials. They are saying that they have assessed their capabilities and institutionally this is their best approach to providing community service. They are not going to have the Davis campus conducting a program in poverty and UCLA conducting one in employment and so forth. This is a very responsible attempt by an institutional system to determine its own capabilities and to acknowledge its responsibilities to the state. This approach represents the kind of responsible planning and self-examination we will be asking for in the future.

I would like to conclude by sharing with you the opinion of a Republican member of the House Committee on Education and Labor. He pointed out that the Senate generally supports continuing education. The Senate is a philosophical body and has no problem supporting continuing education and adult education as a concept. But the House is the pragmatic member of the family. It is very difficult to get a positive commitment out of the House. If a Congressman's constituents tell him that a federal program is beneficial to their district, then he will vote for that program. Whatever the support given by the Senate, during the next few years the fate of Title I will be determined in the House. Title I is successful if the colleges and universities do what Congress thinks cooperative extension did, namely, get out, work with the people, and identify and solve their problems. If you and your institutions of higher education do this, the problem of funding will become no problem at all.

The Situation Around Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965

D. Mack Easton*

I am not a Community Development professional. I am an Extension Dean, a couple of years from emeritus. Why should I attempt to analyze and evaluate --to criticize--the situation which has developed around Title I?

Essentially because I am worried. Essentially because I think that the most important educational opportunity opened up in my lifetime may disappear before it can be effectively acted upon. I hope to communicate that worry. My purpose is both heuristic and polemic. I hope to get you to adopt a specific line of thinking and investigation, and I hope to persuade you to try to do some things which you seem to have only talked about.

I come to you because I think I detect in your thinking and behavior the only promising sign on the horizon.

This is the Community Development Division of NUEA. Let's take a look at how you use the term Community Development.

Actually, you use it to refer to quite different concepts and phenomena. This is no criticism. It has been decades since Ogden and Richards, I think it was, pointed out that, "a word means what it means when it means it," and we are all familiar with the maiden whose "no" meant "maybe."

I want to call attention to some closely-related ways in which you use it.

You use it to define your professional role as educators. Jack Mezirow did this when he said, "The community development process is, in essence, a planned and organized effort to assist individuals to acquire the attitudes, skills, and concepts required for their democratic participation in the effective solution of as wide a range of community improvement problems as possible in an order of priority determined by their increasing levels of competence." And I don't think that Jack would say that a violation of his principle of priority would invalidate the rest of his definition.

Some of you may remember that I tried to tell you at your Gull Lake seminar that this concept lies at the very heart of one of the oldest conceptions of the purpose of education--educare liberos--the development of persons able to deal rationally with their problems.

You also use the term to indicate what happens to the individual in the community process. Bill Biddle did this when he said, "Basically, community development is a social process by which human beings can become

---

*Dean, Extension Division, University of Colorado

more competent to live with and gain some control over local aspects of a frustrating and changing world."

You also use the term to refer to the total process itself, by which intended community change leading to an improvement of the community as such is achieved.

And you use the term to refer to the results of the process.

I think I detect, however, a common element in these four uses of the term. I think most of you agree on a criterion of success. Whether your attention is on the educator's behavior, the development of the learner, the social process of intended change, or the end result--in all these cases, you seem to agree that the sign of success is that the community is improved.

Sometimes, as in Darby, Montana, or in some of Cooperative Extension's Rural Area Development work, the focus has been on economic development, because the community was economically sick--it had a contracting economic base.

Sometimes, as in some of the communities in the program of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the focus has been esthetic or cultural--because the community was unattractive or culturally deprived.

Sometimes, the focus has been on the physical environment in more than an esthetic sense--as in programs leading to urban renewal or improved housing.

Sometimes the focus has been on a social problem, such as a culturally deprived minority, or race relations, or delinquency.

The common element has been the purpose of making the community better--a place where life becomes better through a process of social change intentionally carried out--as opposed to unintended change. And the criterion of success is genuine community improvement.

So conceived, the role of the community developer is, like medicine, a role in applied science, with many empirical elements. And like medicine, it is itself an art, for the same reason that Aristotle pointed out long ago: There is no science of the individual, and all communities, like all persons, are to some extent unique.

You are, then, physicians to the community, interested in stimulating the social processes by which community health can be improved, as medicine is interested in stimulating the biological and psychological processes by which individual health can be improved.

Never has the need for this role been so critical in the history of this civilization.

In personal terms, remember what Joe Brown told you at Carbondale--that the types and rates of change in contemporary society are leading to accelerating rates of human wreckage--in terms of delinquency, crime, mental illness, and suicide.

In physical terms, look at urban blight, rural depopulation, traffic congestion, slaughter on the highways. Lincoln's log cabin was much less pathogenic than an urban slum. My grandfather's community a hundred miles from a railroad was a much healthier economic unit than many shrinking rural villages of today. New York's horse cars actually got people to their

destination faster than New York's buses today. And all the wars we have ever been in have killed fewer Americans than the automobile has killed.

In social terms, look at the plight of the poorer third of our fellow-citizens--socially isolated, culturally deprived, increasingly underemployed, mostly hopeless--a society of degradation inside an affluent society. A hundred years ago, the indentured penniless orphan could learn farming on the job, save money for a team and a plow after his indenture was ended, and move onto free land to build an upward-bound career for himself and his children. Today, millions of children are condemned to failure before they are old enough to enter school.

But no matter what comparisons you make between two points in time, remember what Margaret Meade has put so well: The most important change we must deal with is the change in the rate of change.

I honestly believe that the continued existence of our civilization depends on our ability to deal rationally with the problems, existing and emerging, with which we are faced. Western civilization has a long past, but it may have a short future.

Not all these existing and emerging problems are community problems, but many are. They are the ones we are concerned with this morning.

And they are the ones with which Title I of the Higher Education Act is concerned.

Title I authorizes appropriations "For the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems...." (Sec. 101) It puts no limits on the types of community problems involved, but it does illustrate Congressional intent: "...housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health and land use...." (Sec. 101) These are as urgent as any I know, and there is not a simple one in the lot.

The Act calls for fifty-four "state" plans, each of which must "set forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and state-wide system of community service programs." (Sec. 105 (a) (2)) Several of these words we will need to come back to: Comprehensive can mean "inclusive, not limited." System can can mean "an integrated whole." Community Service Programs is limited by law to educational programs designed to assist in the solution of community problems. Other kinds of community service are not eligible for funds. The bill passed by the Senate was not this narrow. I think you should know when both houses had acted and the bills were on their way to a conference committee, I attempted to influence the committee in the direction of the broader (Senate) version.

And I think you should know why. I wrote to two members of the conference committee. Perhaps one paragraph of the letter is enough for our purposes this morning.

> I think it is fair to say that the development of service units designed to serve the whole community is only in its pioneering stage in American universities. The kind of man who can assist the members of a community to identify the community's problems, to make judgments on priorities, to

bring to bear on those problems the analytical skills, special know-how, planning ability and leadership skills (whether available in the community or brought in from outside) necessary to deal with the problems--this kind of man is in very short supply, in the judgment of some of us who have held key positions in our national organizations. Yet, without this kind of social catalyst, the House Title I will inevitably lead to the development of discrete community services, not necessarily attacking the most important problems of communities at all.

I want to make it clear that my objection was to the tremendous difficulty involved in launching soundly conceived educational programs designed to deal effectively with community problems in fifty-four states and territories at the same time under current manpower conditions. If the social situation is what I think it is, Title I of the Higher Education Act is potentially more important than the Smith-Lever Act, in spite of the fact that the industrial, economic, scientific, educational, and cultural progress we have seen since 1915 could not have occurred, for want of manpower, had it not been for the rise in agricultural productivity per man in which agricultural extension played so large a part. We have fewer farmers today than during the Civil War. All our growth in population has been available for other occupations.

Title I is potentially even more important, and potentially a failure. If it fails, our attempts to deal with the destructive aspects of change will receive a dangerous set-back which could lead to catastrophic consequences.

Why is it potentially a failure?

The universities aren't ready for it. And they aren't ready for it in several respects.

One of the most critical factors may lie in the difference between serving individuals, formal organizations, and communities. Let me remind you of just one example of this difference. Both in the case of individuals and of formal organizations, you know who it is that you must teach. In the case of communities, whose opinions count on what subjects and what they must be taught have to be discovered. Neither faculty members nor ordinary extension men often know how to do this. Sometimes you don't do too well yourselves. And there aren't many of you.

Another critical factor is the nature of community problems. There is a sense in which communities do not have medical problems, engineering problems, educational problems, economic problems, communication problems, or psychological problems--they have community problems with medical, engineering, educational, economic, communications, and psychological aspects--and others besides.

Such problems need a comprehensive, systematic approach--just what Title I asks for. Community problems are seldom solved by dealing with discrete aspects in isolation. Let's look at an example.

Such urban problems as housing, transportation, land use, and recreation all involve a need for good urban planning.

But to raise the competence of the professional planners won't be effective.

To raise the competence of the planning commissions won't be effective.

To raise the competence of the urban officials won't be effective.

To increase the understanding of the voters won't be effective.

To improve the quality of the mass media won't be effective.

To solve the problem of financing the work won't be effective.

To do all of these things, in the right order, at the right time might be effective--but, on the other hand, there may be still other critical factors. I have mentioned phases of the problem involving a half-dozen professions and disciplines just to get rational planning with regard to a problem. Much more must be done if it is to be solved.

Universities are not used to such comprehensive, inter-disciplinary, inter-professional programs. Only a few are organized to make them even possible. Yet comprehensive attacks on problems are needed.

As Piet Hein, the Dane, has put it, "All problems lose their meaning when we amputate them, cut off what we want in order to make them fit into our random frames of specialization." Yet this is the customary way for the academic specialist to work.

The universities were not ready for Title I because most of them had no knowledge of how to work with a community as a client--particularly an urban community--and because they were not prepared for a comprehensive, systematic approach to community problems. Need I go further?

Heroic efforts have sometimes overcome such handicaps. And I think heroic efforts were clearly involved in getting the program started. If I remember correctly, forty-nine state plans were developed and approved in less than three months. That is real evidence of heroic work by the Office of Education, the state agencies, and the educational institutions.

But where are we today?

Jules Pagano reported to a group of Extension Deans in November--and the report is printed in the December-January Spectator--that 33 per cent of all Title I funds was being spent "to improve the professional or technical skills of such groups as doctors, teachers, and civil servants. Two per cent of the funds goes to devising self-help programs for the aging.

"Seventeen per cent of the funds goes to urban and regional development.... About 5 per cent goes to help solve the problems of racial discrimination and racial tension." Etc.

This does not sound like a comprehensive attack on anything.

I have examined in detail a roster by states of all projects granted fiscal 1966 funds. I think it fair to say that an overwhelming majority--almost all--seem to be discrete, isolated, attacks on a single phase of a complex problem.

This was to be expected. It was the only way to get started fast, considering the way the law was written. But if this pattern becomes precedent, the program may well be doomed.

I say may, because I am depending on pipelines to Congress which may be unreliable, and because I am not confident that I grasp adequately the mood

of the people who count in this situation. I feel a blunt "will be doomed" is justified.

Why?

My pipelines report that Congress is tired of statistical reports on the number of people served, the hours of service--in general, the data on intermediate phenomena. The members of Congress want end results. They ask, "What difference did it make? Did it get the results intended? Was the net effect an improvement?" And an increasing number of voters are concerned about slum redevelopment projects that improve the real estate but displace the slum dweller and aggravate the social problems. They are increasingly concerned about freeway construction which increases highway capacity without increasing traffic efficiency and does it at the cost of blighting neighborhoods and aggravating other social problems. They are increasingly concerned about programs which increase the education of members of minorities without opening up opportunities for that education to be put to constructive use. The concern in Washington itself may be reflected in the Model Cities program, which makes possible the coordination of the broadest spectrum of therapeutic action ever possible in this country--a spectrum of which everything that can be done under Title I is a minor part.

If we had to start with discrete projects attacking selected facets of complex problems, if we must show tangible results in terms of community improvement, if this kind of result cannot be achieved by the kinds of projects currently going on, we need some leadership some place.

And I think this really is the situation. I have not been able to investigate the projects funded with fiscal 1967 funds, but in our state they constitute smaller projects attacking isolated elements of more problems than the previous year. They should have strengthened ongoing work and supplemented it by attacking other elements in the same problems involved in the first year's programs.

If my state is reasonably typical, we need someone to lead us from project-oriented thinking to problem-oriented thinking, from the approach by discipline or profession to the comprehensive approach.

In theory, the needed leadership could come from any of a number of sources.

It might come from the National Council established under Title I. I don't think it can. That Council includes two outstanding leaders in general university extension, but neither is a student or practitioner in the field of intended community change. And I don't think anyone else on the Council is.

It might come from the federal agency. When Jules Pagano spoke to some Deans in November, I thought I saw signs justifying optimism. If you have read his talk in the Spectator, you may have had the same impression. But current signs are discouraging. Let me cite two such signs.

I have copies of two letters from Washington which state that the identification of community problems is the responsibility of the state agency. This statement will suggest to many readers that the state agency will send a person or persons into a community with the attitude "You have a delinquency problem which is so bad I have been sent to help you solve it. Let's start a

seminar next week for the City Council, the School Board and Superintendent, and the Police Chief."

I would hate to enter a community under such circumstances. I think at least most of you will agree that community problems must be recognized by the community. I doubt whether the state agency should normally do more than judge priorities and programs on the basis of professional staff work.

I also have a copy of the "Notice of Activation...." form for Title I programs. It asks, among other things, for:

1. names of cooperating institutions
2. cost per participant
3. a detailed description of the program, including "program content, the methods and materials to be employed, the faculty resources involved, and, where applicable, the frequency and duration of sessions"

I suggest that the language of this form will tend to influence institutions to stay in the most traditional patterns of group instruction. Jules Pagano may appeal all he wants to for rational innovations, but he can't expect effective ones if such language is used in requiring official reports.

Since first drafting this speech, I have received another document, the implications of which seem even clearer. To make it understandable, I will have to give you some personal background.

The University of Colorado has presented a Title I proposal designed to deal with the problem of lack of community readiness for effective work on community problems. It proposes to try to give community leaders:

1. an increased understanding of community problems and of ways of dealing with them
2. an understanding of the need to identify problems and to analyze them as a basis for planning
3. a knowledge and understanding of the types of assistance available and of the ways to use such assistance
4. an understanding of, and skill in the planning process
5. an understanding of the methods of developing community support for putting plans into action
6. an understanding of methods of checking results as a basis for improving plans and programs as they are carried out.

If these things can be accomplished, we believe that both the quality and the quantity of social processes relevant to all community problems can be improved. And we believe that specific proposals to local, state, and federal government agencies will be more numerous and of better quality.

The proposal was given the highest priority by our advisory committee and approved by our state agency.

But Washington has written the state agency:

> If populations to be served cannot be described, or the curriculum (or program content) described, or a detailed description of the program, activity or service to be provided cannot be made, we believe the program should not be funded until such information is developed.

If that sentence means what it seems to mean, Title I funds currently

are not available to put the University at the heart of the social process, and the comprehensive system I think the act calls for is impossible. You can't know in advance who advises the mayor, or anyone else. You discover it in the process of working with the mayor, if you know how. And if you could identify the real leadership in advance, you wouldn't know how much sociology, or public law--or anything else--you would have to get him to learn until you had worked with him for awhile. There is little you can say in advance about community leadership except that it is composed of persons whose decisions count. What the agency wants to know in advance is what it ought to be asking for in progress reports.

Remember that the whole of this speech, except this insert, was written before I had any inkling that our project was in jeopardy. I think our individual problem probably can be worked out. But I have seen no clearer evidence that the kind of leadership currently needed cannot be expected from Washington, and hence I am reporting it. I can find no evidence that the agency comprehends the problem of evoking and securing effective processes of desired social change.

Don't misunderstand me. The solution of many community problems probably involves the preplanned group instruction of adults on a unprecedented scale. I can give you examples if you need them. But this activity is not at the heart of intended social change. By themselves, such programs are what Piet Hein called the amputation of parts of a problem to fit random frames of specialization.

In theory, the leadership could come from the state agencies. Read their names. To me, they suggest no grounds for hope.

In Colorado, the state agency is the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. It has a small staff composed of excellent professional men. However, they have <u>not</u> been selected for their competence in guiding or assisting social change. They can't give the needed leadership--they are part of the need.

In theory, the leadership could come from the universities. I have already indicated why, as institutions, they, too, are part of the need. Most of them are not used to serving communities as clients, and most of them are not organized for comprehensive programs.

Gentlemen, I am convinced that if effective leadership emerges at all, it must come from this group here, from this Division of NUEA.

Maybe my analysis is wrong. I frankly hope so. It is an administrator's analysis, based on available information some of which is no more than ambiguous signs. But if you look at the society from which the program emerges, if you examine Congressional intent and expectations, if you examine the Act and the regulations, if you look at the federal and state agencies and the institutions involved, if you look at what has happened to date, if you look at the nature of the social process, if you look at the possible sources of leadership, including yourselves, --in other words, if you examine the total situation--I think you will come to the conclusion I have reached.

To be sure, there are elements in the situation about which I have said

nothing--university presidents, for instance. I don't think, however, you can find any such unnamed element in the situation from which you can reasonably expect the needed initiative.

I know you have other things to do. I know you are busy. But the university extension movement could not have reached its current development without a lot of self-sacrifice by many men, and, as the Bible puts it, "To him who knoweth to do and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

I want to recommend the line of action taken by two physicians in Dakota concerning a patient who was critically ill. At one point in their consulting, one said to the other, "Amoebic dysentery in South Dakota seems impossible. But I agree that is what it looks like. You start treatment on that basis at once and I'll make the laboratory tests to see if we are right." The plan was followed and the patient recovered. If they had made the lab tests before starting treatment, the patient would have died.

So start checking my analysis of symptoms to see if my diagnosis is wrong.

But also start, today, to treat the patient.

Set up lines of communication with the federal agency. What happened to the plan you adopted last year--in the resolution presented by Bosworth? I think that plan made lots of sense. The men I know in the federal agency are intelligent, dedicated men. I am sure they will listen if you put first things first, and a continuing dialogue is needed.

But this is only one step you should take at once. I would like to see you develop methods of oreinting both the agencies and the institutions. They need to learn what a "comprehensive system" is, as the term refers to Title I programs. They need some insight into the process of goal-oriented community change. They need to understand the need for coordination at the local level on a basis much broader than Title I. Perhaps we need a national institutue or workshop. Perhaps it could be the joint effort of you and the federal agency. I have some ideas on the subject I will be glad to leave with your chairman and with the federal agency, but they should be viewed as part of the beginning and not as a finished program plan.

I think you should also take a third.step--maybe a third and a fourth. We need more professional, and approximations of professionals, to meet the current emergency. I propose you do two things about the problem:

1. Look over the national scene and see if you can find some way by which either professional curricula can be established at more universities or the output of the graduate curricula which already exist can be increased, or a combination of both.

2. See if you can develop effective short programs for the in-service orientation and training of persons currently responsible for Title I work. Perhaps a multiple-format program in which a series of institutes and workshops are connected by high-quality correspondence study is the answer.

I strongly recommend all four of these steps: cooperation with the federal office, orientation programs for the state agencies and educational institutions, increased output of professional curricula, and first-aid in-service programs for people currently responsible for Title I work. By the time you

have finished your own diagnosis, you may find other ways to improve the situation.

We must find some way to get beyond what Jack Mezirow last year called "unrelated and emphemeral" projects.

The communities which are our patients will not be cured by treating the symptoms or by treating individual organs.

The patient can only be made reasonably healthy by improving the volume and the quality of the decisions and actions involved in effective community change for positive values. He is suffering from acute projectitis involving a breakdown of the communication processes of his central nervous system. Check the diagnosis, but start treatment immediately.

In case you lack confidence in your own wisdom to do what I ask, let me end by quoting Piet Hein again:

The road to wisdom? --Well, it's plain and simple to express:

Err
and err
and err again
but less
and less
and less

THE LIBRARY OF
OCT 13 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION